

501

# THE ROMANIC REVIEW

FOUNDED BY PROFESSOR HENRY ALFRED TODD

A QUARTERLY PUBLICATION OF  
THE DEPARTMENT OF ROMANCE LANGUAGES  
IN COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS • PUBLISHERS

---

VOLUME XLI • DECEMBER 1950 • NUMBER FOUR

---



# THE ROMANIC REVIEW

A QUARTERLY PUBLICATION

NORMAN L. TORREY, *General Editor*

JEAN-ALBERT BÉDÉ

DINO BIGONGLIARI

ENRICO DE' NEGRI

OTIS FELLOWS

DONALD M. FRAME

W. M. FROHOCK

JEAN HYTIER

TOMÁS NAVARRO

JUSTIN O'BRIEN

FEDERICO DE ONÍS

LAWTON P. G. PECKHAM

MARIO A. PEI

JEANNE VARNEY PLEASANTS

JOSÉ ANTONIO PORTUONDO

JAMES F. SHEARER

NATHAN EDELMAN, *Managing Editor*

VOLUME XLI

DECEMBER 1950

NUMBER 4

## ARTICLES

- The Passion Lance Relic and the War Cry Monjoie in the *Chanson de Roland* and Related Texts LAURA HIBBARD LOOMIS 241
- Night Scenes in Tirso de Molina E. H. TEMPLIN 261
- Latin and Italian Grammar in the Year 1486 LYNN THORNDIKE 274

## REVIEWS

- Jean Sonet, *Le Roman de Barlaam et Josaphat: recherches sur la tradition manuscrite latine et française*. [JEAN MISRAHI] 276
- J. E. Shaw, *Guido Cavalcanti's Theory of Love. The Canzone d'Amore and Other Related Problems*. [THOMAS G. BERGIN] 277
- John C. Lapp, editor, *The Universe of Pontus de Tyard*. [DONALD M. FRAME] 281
- Hiram Haydn, *The Counter-Renaissance*. [DONALD M. FRAME] 284
- Verdun L. Saulnier, *Maurice Scève*. [JOHN C. LAPP] 289
- August Rüegg, *Miguel de Cervantes und sein Don Quijote*. [HELMUT HATZFELD] 293
- José M. de Osma, editor, *El verdadero Dios Pan. Auto sacramental alegórico de Don Pedro Calderón de la Barca*. [EVERETT W. HESSE] 298

Jean Fabre, editor, Denis Diderot: <i>Le Neveu de Rameau</i> . [NORMAN L. TORREY]	299
Henry Carrington Lancaster, <i>French Tragedy in the Time of Louis XV and Voltaire, 1715-1774</i> . [C. D. BRENNER]	302
Georges Collas, Amédée Outrey, Louis Martin-Chauffier, Pierre Moreau, Armand Weil, Pierre Clarac, Charles H. Pouthas, Victor-L. Tapié, H. Le Savoureux, Marie-Jeanne Durry, Yvon Delbos, Maurice Levailant, <i>Chateaubriand. Le Livre du Centenaire</i> . [EMILE MALAKIS]	304
E. R. Vincent, <i>Byron, Hobhouse and Foscolo: New Documents in the History of a Collaboration</i> . [ERNEST H. WILKINS]	305
Edith Melcher, <i>The Life and Times of Henry Monnier. 1799-1877</i> . [HENRI PEYRE]	307
A. G. Haudricourt and A. G. Juilland, <i>Essai pour une histoire structurale du phonétisme français</i> . [FREDRICK JUNGEMANN]	309
Books Received	314
Index	315

THE ROMANIC REVIEW is published four times a year (February-April-October-December) by Columbia University Press, Mt. Royal and Guilford Aves., Baltimore 2, Md. Single copies, \$1.25 (foreign \$1.35); \$5.00 a year (foreign, including Canada, \$5.30). Subscribers should notify the publisher of change of address at least three weeks before publication of issue with which change is to take effect. Entered as second-class matter, at the post office at Baltimore, Md., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Copyright 1950 by Columbia University Press.

Manuscripts, editorial communications and books for review should be addressed to Professor Norman L. Torrey, Philosophy Hall, Columbia University, New York City. THE REVIEW will not be responsible for the return of manuscripts unless accompanied by a self-addressed, stamped envelope. For all questions regarding preparation of manuscripts and printing style, consult the "Notes for Contributors" at the end of the February issue.

All communications of a business nature should be addressed to Columbia University Press, Mt. Royal and Guilford Aves., Baltimore 2, Md., or 2960 Broadway, New York 27, N. Y.



## THE PASSION LANCE RELIC AND THE WAR CRY MONJOIE IN THE *CHANSON DE ROLAND* AND RELATED TEXTS

ONE of the most sensational events of the First Crusade was the discovery at Antioch in 1098 of what was supposed to be the lance-head that had pierced the side of Christ. In the twentieth century, when the possible influence of the Crusades on the *Chanson de Roland* has been studied more and more searchingly,<sup>1</sup> the famous eleventh-century event has become a sharply disputed point in *Roland* scholarship. Was the poet's statement that the tip of the Passion Lance was in Charlemagne's sword hilt written before or after 1098, with or without knowledge of the Antioch lance? It is the purpose of this article to review briefly previous theories on the matter, and to offer new evidence both as to the probable written source of what we shall call the Lance passage in the *Roland*, and as to the tradition of a French Lance relic, a relic with Carolingian associations even in the ninth and tenth centuries. We shall also consider the textual evidence, provided by the manuscripts of the *Roland* itself, that the war cry Monjoie, whatever its ultimate origin, came, so far as the poet knew and said, from the holy relic in Charlemagne's sword Joyeuse. Though none of this will bring us to a precise date for the *Roland*, it will at least serve, I hope, to take the "must" out of arguments based on the Lance passage, arguments which assert that the great poem "must" be dated after 1098.

### JOYEUSE AND MONJOIE

Whatever the date or place of origin of the *Chanson de Roland*,<sup>2</sup> it is now agreed that the oldest extant copy was written in England by an Anglo-Norman scribe between 1130 and 1150.<sup>3</sup> In this manuscript, com-

1. For surveys of opinions dating the poem before or after the First Crusade, see Joseph Bédier, *La Chanson de Roland, commentée*, Paris, 1927, pp. 40-64; Raoul Mortier, *La Chanson de Roland, essai d'interprétation du problème des origines*, Paris, 1939, ch. IV.

2. A. Pauphilet, "La Date du Roland," *Études dédiées à Mario Roques*, Paris, 1946, p. 7: "La date... il n'est guère dans la littérature médiévale de question plus importante, ni plus embarrassante." Pauphilet argued for a date before 1064 and severely criticized the work of E. Mireaux (*La Chanson de Roland et l'histoire de France*, Paris, 1945, pp. 208 ff.) who dated the poem about 1154. Cf. also Louis Michel's severe review of Mireaux, "Les Origines et les transformations de la *Chanson de Roland*, examen d'une théorie nouvelle," *Revue Belge de Philologie et d'Histoire*, XXV (1946-1947), 258-301.

3. *La Chanson de Roland, reproduction phototypique du MS Digby 23*, éd. par le comte Alexandre de Laborde; *Étude paléographique* de Ch. Samaran, Paris, 1932, présentée au Roxburghe Club de Londres, vol. 196, p. 38. Cf. Pauphilet, *loc. cit.*, p. 7: "[la date] n'est généralement discutée." In recent editions of the *Roland*, F.

only called the Oxford *Roland* (O, Bodleian, Digby 23) the Lance passage occurs in *laisse* CLXXXIII. The whole of this *laisse* is quoted below:<sup>4</sup>

<i>Li emperere s'est culcet en un pret;</i>	2496
<i>Sun grant espïet met a sun chef li ber;</i>	
<i>Icele noït ne se volt il desarmer,</i>	
<i>Si ad vestut sun blanc osberc sasfret,</i>	
<i>Laciet sun elme, ki est a or gemmet,</i>	2500
<i>Ceinte Joiuse, unches ne fut sa per,</i>	
<i>Ki cascun jur muet XXX clartez.</i>	
<i>Asez savum de la lance parler</i>	
<i>Dunt Nostre Sire fut en la cruiz nasfret;</i>	
<i>Carles en ad la mure, mercit Deu;</i>	2505
<i>En l'oret punt l'ad faite manuvrer.</i>	
<i>Pur ceste honur e pur ceste bontet,</i>	
<i>Li num's Joiuse l'espee fut dunet.</i>	
<i>Baruns françois nel deivent ublier;</i>	
<i>Enseigne en unt de "Munjoiel" crier;</i>	2510
<i>Pur ço nes poet nule gent cuntrester.</i>	

Piety, pride, patriotism give to these sixteen lines their glowing fervor. They have that *précellence* which Bédier<sup>5</sup> claimed for the Oxford manuscript as a whole. No other French text of the *Chanson de Roland*, no foreign redaction, as M. Mortier's recent invaluable edition of all the texts of the poem makes plain, adds anything of significance to this passage; elsewhere the lines of O are repeated or weakly diluted, shortened or omitted.<sup>6</sup> So far as this passage is concerned, the other texts might all be read as derivatives of O.<sup>7</sup> Among the French manuscripts, only two omit all mention of the Lance and the explanation given in O for the names Joyeuse and Monjoie. Since these two manuscripts, L and T, were derived from the same source as P,<sup>8</sup> which contains the whole passage, the omission would seem to have been deliberate.

Whitehead (Oxford, 1942, p. v, n. 1) observed: "Before Samaran the majority of scholars thought Digby not copied before 1170"; Gardner, Woods and Hilton (Boston, London, 1942, p. xii) noted: "Samaran has established that this MS was made by an Anglo-Norman scribe about 1140."

4. For a facsimile, see Laborde, *op. cit.*, f. 45 v. All quotations from the *Roland* are from the edition of all the manuscripts by Raoul Mortier, *Les Textes de la Chanson de Roland*, X tomes, Paris, 1940-1944. For MS O, *laisse* CLXXXIII, cf. I, 71.

5. Bédier, *op. cit.*, pp. 93-125.

6. For the corresponding passage in other manuscripts, cf. Mortier, *Textes* (cited by volume and page): MS V<sup>4</sup> in II, 79; C in IV, 121; V<sup>7</sup> in V, xxx; P in VI, 78; T in VII, 61; L in VIII, 43. The Lorraine fragments, t. IX, have nothing relating to this section of the poem.

7. On the general relation of the manuscripts to each other, see E. Faral, *La Chanson de Roland*, Paris, 1932, pp. 47 ff.: "Aucun des textes conservés dans les divers manuscrits de Venise (V), de Châteauroux (C), de Paris (P) ou d'ailleurs ne permet de remonter à une tradition ancienne qui aurait différé par sa contexture de la rédaction d'Oxford." This was also the opinion of Pauphilet, *loc. cit.*, p. 8. Bédier (*op. cit.*, p. 84) derived all the versions except O from a lost poem a, and O and a from the same archetype.

8. *Table de filiation*, Bédier, *ibid.*, p. 85; Mortier, *Textes*, I, viii, ix.

The omission is less easy to explain in the earliest of the foreign redactions of the *Roland*. Despite some recurrent controversy about the date when Pfaffe Konrad wrote his *Ruolandes Liet*, a date between 1131 and 1133 is generally accepted.<sup>9</sup> At the end of the poem (verses 9063-9083), he said he was translating first into Latin, then into German, a French book (*ane theme buoche gescriben . . . in franzischer zungen*).<sup>10</sup> This was closely related to O, but in actual bulk the German poem is almost twice the length of this earliest version in French. Much of the added material was of a pietistic character. If the Lance passage appeared in Konrad's source, his omission of a feature so pleasing to his religious taste would be strange indeed.<sup>11</sup> Konrad's ignorance of the Lance passage seems still further indicated by his use of the name Monjoie, for which that passage offered a specific explanation. The great war cry resounds "halte ment et cler," through the whole of the Oxford *Roland*; it occurs fourteen times.<sup>12</sup> In Konrad's version it is mentioned only four times, once as Monsoi (verse 881), thrice as Monscoi (verses 4069, 4420, 8164), and with no more comment than that it was "*thes keiseres zeichen*" (verse 4069). Konrad had apparently no understanding of its meaning, yet he would have had one explanation had he read the Lance passage. Either he read and ignored it, or else he read some continental version which did not include the passage.

The Anglo-Norman copy of the *Roland* in MS O had additional information about the war cry: it explained how the same name was given to the oriflamme, formerly called Romaine:

"Munjoie!" escrient; od els est Charlemagne.  
Gefreid d'Anjou portel l'orie flambe:  
Seint Pierre fut (. . .), si aveit num Romaine;  
Mais de Munjoie illec out pris exchange.

3092

9. Against Mireaux's dating (*op. cit.*, pp. 97-99) of the *Ruolandes Liet*, ca. 1170, see Michel, *loc. cit.*, p. 271. The date, 1131-1133, was accepted by Bédier, p. 40, on the basis of E. Schroeder's arguments in his edition of Konrad's *Kaiserchronik*. In *Les Légendes épiques*, 3<sup>e</sup> éd., Paris, 1929 (= *Légendes*), III, 187, Bédier spoke of the German poem as "une traduction libre de la Chanson de Roland et la plus ancienne des imitations étrangères;" R. Fawtier (*La Chanson de Roland, étude historique*, Paris, 1933, p. 65) thought Konrad's translation furnished a *terminus ad quem* for the composition of the French poem.

10. *Das Rolandeslied*, ed. Karl Bartsch, Leipzig, 1874. Quotations are from this edition; for Bartsch's discussion of Konrad's sources and his pietistic expansions, see pp. xi ff. Mortier (*Textes*, X) provided both a facsimile and a French translation of the German poem. Where the Lance passage should occur, between 7073-7080, there are verses reminiscent of O, vss. 2495, 2482-2488, 2480, 2499, 2519, 2520, but nothing to suggest O, vss. 2501-2509. For Mortier's discussion of the *Ruolandes Liet*, see his *Essai*, pp. 125, 166-168.

11. Wolfgang Golther (*Das Rolandeslied des Pfaffe Konrad*, Munich, 1887, p. 48) thought that Konrad had deliberately omitted the Lance verses in order to insert the Cross legend told by him in vss. 7476-7484. But this was no new legend but merely an over-literal translation of material in O, vss. 2847-2848. Golther (p. 99) urged that Konrad's source for the whole poem was a redaction represented by *Roland* MS V<sup>a</sup> and the *Karlsmagnus Saga*.

12. Mortier, *Textes*, I, vss. 1181, 1234, 1260, 1350, 1378, 1525, 1974, 2151, 2510, 3092, 3095, 3300, 3565, 3620. The word always appears in O as Munioie except for Munioe, vs. 1378. Cf. Laborde, *op. cit.*, I, 25 v., vs. 5.

In a memorable study of the name in *Les Légendes épiques*,<sup>13</sup> Bédier (II, 248) remarked: " 'Montjoie!' Ce cri, si récent fût-il à l'époque de *Roland*, était déjà obscur et provoquait l'effort des étymologistes." On the next page he called attention to these two "étymologies," the one just given and the one in the Lance passage, as not necessarily coming from the same author; one might be an interpolation. For this conjecture no reason was offered. And in point of fact it must be noted that war cries were not a recent innovation; they had long been known. The Romaine passage, moreover, does not offer an etymology but the plain substitution of one name for another. It assumes the existence of the cry and the explanation previously given for the name (verses 3092 ff.) In the poet's mind and words, the war cry plainly antedated its association with the oriflamme. The Lance passage, the oriflamme passage, do not suggest different authors, nor does one seem more an interpolation than the other. It seems rather as if the same poet were trying to harmonize different sources, different stories, with his own unified purpose.<sup>14</sup>

This brings us to a consideration of the famous word itself. In the Oxford *Roland* it is spelled Munioie (printed Munjoie), and that is the basis for every variant spelling in other manuscripts (Monjoie, Monçoia, etc.). The statement may be verified by comparing the line references for Munjoie in O, here listed in note 12, with the line references from O given by M. Mortier at the right of each of the *Roland* texts he has published. No one of them ever uses the spelling Montjoie save for a single instance in T, verse 622 (Mortier, VII), a manuscript of the late fifteenth or early sixteenth century. It has ten Monjoies. Konrad's poem shows that he likewise knew nothing of Montjoie. So far then as *Roland* manuscripts are concerned there is no textual authority whatever, until the one instance in T, the latest of them all, for the spelling with *mont*. But this fact has been almost universally ignored and there is hardly a modernization

13. *Légendes*, II, 237-252. On p. 248, n. 1, he mistakenly observed that war cries were not known before the First Crusade. Yet a few earlier instances had been given by Ducange, "Du Cry d'armes," in his *Dissertation* (XI) *sur l'histoire de saint Louis* (reprinted in Ducange's *Glossarium*, ed. G. Herschel et L. Favre, Paris, 1938, X, 38-43). For references to war cries in the *Ludwiglied* (9th century) and by Liudprand of Cremona (d. 972), Thietmar of Merseburg (d. 1018), and Aimoin of Fleury (early 11th century), see Carl Erdmann, *Die Entstehung des Kreuzzugsgedankens*, Stuttgart, 1935, pp. 83-84. Erdmann commented on the double meaning in the *Roland* and elsewhere of *enseigne* as war cry and banner. Cf. also his ch. VI, "Vexillum Sancti Petri."

14. For theories before 1939 about the oriflamme and the war cry, see Mortier, *Essai*, pp. 104-109; for summarizing comment on later theories that identify various hills as Montjoie, see Jean Favière, "Montjoie et Moutjoie," *Romania*, LXIX (1946), 101-103. For a forthcoming article by the present writer, "The Oriflamme of France and the War Cry Monjoie in the Twelfth Century," see a volume to be published by the Pierpont Morgan Library in honor of its late Director, Miss Belle da Costa Greene. Here it need only be emphasized that actual twelfth-century manuscripts do not connect the cry or the banner with either a *mont* or with St. Denis. On this matter there has been general misapprehension.

or translation of the poem, or comment on it, that does not use Montjoie.<sup>15</sup> Almost universally Ducange's opinion (*Glossarium*, X, 40) has been accepted that the *Roland's* *mun* or *mon* represented, as it often did elsewhere, a shortened form of *mont*. Bédier himself, despite his passion for textual accuracy, in mentioning the war cry, always used Montjoie. Yet it was he who, in the study referred to, threw lasting doubt on the attempts of Ducange, Sepet, and others, to identify Montjoie with some specific *Mons Gaudii* known to French pilgrims. Even when quoting the words "*Meum gaudium*, quod Francorum signum est," from Ordericus Vitalis, Bédier (II, 248, note 1) referred to him as "le premier historien qui mentionne le cri de Montjoie." Similarly Ducange spoke of Ordericus as saying, "Montjoie estoit le cry des François"; Mortier (*Essai*, page 105), recently, has said the same thing. Now whatever, in the opinion of scholars, Ordericus ought to have said, it is certain, even from their own quotations, that he wrote *meum gaudium* and at a time (ca. 1135) contemporary with *Roland* (O.)<sup>16</sup> He knew the *Roland* in some form, for, in another passage, he likened the crusading hero Bohemond to Roland, "francigeno Rolando." His unmistakable Latin words should not be changed; his *meum* was not *mont*. It agreed with the Munjoie of the Oxford *Roland* and practically all subsequent *Roland* manuscripts.

The origin of the cry Monjoie has been interpreted in no fewer than twelve different ways. In Kurt Löffel's *Beiträge zur Geschichte von Montjoie* (Tübingen, 1934), pages 17-18, he listed these various explanations and the writers who proposed them; the first two were those we have noted from the *Roland* itself; then came the derivations from *meum gaudium*, *meum Jovem*, *montis gaudium*, *moult de joie*, *Mon(t)joie de saint Denis*, *mons*, *monticulus*, *mons Jovis*, Frankish *mund gawi*, *mons gaudii*. Though he quoted (page 18) the text of the Oxford *Roland*, he referred to the war cry only as Montjoie, and dismissed the explanation given in the Lance passage as "zu phantasievoll, als dass man ernstlich zur Diskussion bringen könnte" (page 18).

Though few would now put the matter so bluntly, there has been, none the less, ever since the discovery of the Oxford *Roland*, increasing agreement that the Lance passage must be disregarded. The poet's clear statements about the Lance relic and the names Joyeuse and Monjoie had obviously no connection with a *mont*; but since later writers were sure that

15. A few early writers on the *Roland* thought that *mon* was derived from *meum* and modified *joie*, a masculine noun derived from *gaudium*. Cf. F. Génin, *La Chanson de Roland, poème de Théroutle*, Paris, 1850, pp. 421-424. He interpreted *monjoie* as *mon joyau*, i.e., the Lance relic. In his long note he remarked that the spelling of Monjoie, with or without the *t*, might be "le nœud et la solution du problème."

16. Ordericus Vitalis died ca. 1141. Cf. Charles Gross, *Sources and Literature of English History*, 2d ed., London, 1915, p. 383. For Orderic's *meum gaudium*, see his *Historia Ecclesiastica*, ed. A. Le Prévost, 5 vols., Paris, 1838-1855, IV, 341. Prévost's note asserted: "Notre auteur traduit fort inexactement [!] ici le cri de guerre français Montjoie Saint Denis." On Orderic's own reference (III, 186) to the *Roland*, see Fawtier, *op. cit.*, pp. 66-67.

the cry came from some Montjoie, the poet must have been wrong. Presumably the fundamental reason for this conclusion was grammatical; *joie* was known only as a feminine noun and so could not be preceded by a masculine *mon*; *mon* must be a shortened form of *mont*. Though Godefroy (*Dictionnaire*, V, 400) had given three examples of a masculine *joie* from the poems of G. de Soignies, these were ignored, and the possibility that *joie* might be a noun of double gender was not discussed. Yet in medieval French, as Professor Mildred Pope (*From Latin to Modern French*, Manchester, 1934, page 305) has observed, "double genders were relatively frequent." Löffel (page 25) noted from Diez (*Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, 1878) a masculine *joie* in Provençal. But a masculine *joie* in northern Old French had not, I believe, been specified until Professor Jean Misrahi, speaking of Professor Roach's edition of *The Continuations of the Old French Perceval of Chrétien de Troyes* (Philadelphia, 1949), called my attention to the following instance:

*Mais li quatre ont tant chevalchié. . .* 12455

*Et devant le roi sont venu.* 12457

*Tels joie mais ne fu veü.*

In commenting to me on this passage Professor Misrahi observed that the masculine gender is indicated both by *tels* and by *veü*, which rimes with *venu* (masculine plural); elsewhere, in this Picard manuscript (Bibliothèque Nationale, fonds français 12576) of the second half of the thirteenth century, we find *merveilleuse joie* (verse 12409), and this feminine *joie* appears again (verse 13492) in a notable passage, to be quoted presently, on the Holy Lance itself. In northern France the Latin *gaudia* as a feminine singular seems generally to have replaced the neuter *gaudium* but there must have been continued awareness, especially among clerics, that Latin neuters commonly became masculine nouns in French. The masculine Munioie of *Roland* (O), used as it is in connection with a holy relic, does not represent a grammatical error. It is a clerical rather than a popular rendering of *meum gaudium*.

Monjoie, the war cry, said the poet, came from the sword Joyeuse. This bore, to quote Bédier's eloquent comment, "le plus beau nom que puisse porter une épée, le nom que seul un Français pouvait inventer, Joyeuse . . . l'espée de France" (*Légendes*, IV, 460). Was the poet thinking of Charlemagne's personal joy in possessing that *joyau* among relics, the tip of the Passion Lance, or of something deeper, more universal? Had he any antecedent authority or suggestion for the idea of putting so holy a relic in a sword hilt, or of making Joyeuse, by reason of the relic, a victory weapon?

No source for this group of ideas has been suggested. Léon Gautier's<sup>17</sup> long note on Joyeuse, the basis for nearly all subsequent comment, brought together many references to the sword, but none that antedated the *Roland*, none that explained these special features. Professor Mario Pei, in his

17. Gautier, *La Chanson de Roland*, 2 vols., Tours, 1872, II, 190-191.



recent book on *French Precursors of the Chanson de Roland* (N. Y., 1948), page 54, remarked that "relics assume a military importance in the epic," and cited three instances in the *Roland* in which relics are mentioned as having been put into weapons: Ganelon swears on those in his sword (verse 607); Roland's own sword is well supplied with them (verses 2345-2348); Charlemagne's sword has the Lance tip. Professor Pei noted no earlier reference to the custom. But there are two instances, both in the tenth century, which deserve special notice. In his *Antapodosis*, a mélange of Latin and Greek, Bishop Liudprand of Cremona (d. 972) described the Lance of Constantine as having on its blade crosses made from the Nails of the Crucifixion.<sup>18</sup> This reference no one, presumably, would think could have been known to the French poet. The other is in a long neglected Anglo-Latin poem which may well have been the source of the *Roland*.

The poem was used by William of Malmesbury as a chief source for the account of King Athelstan (d. 939) in *De Gestis Regum Anglorum* (GRA).<sup>19</sup> William quoted from it sixty-five hexameter lines and carefully summarized the rest of the poem. He had found it, he said (GRA, I, 144)—and it must be remembered that William was librarian of his abbey—in an ancient volume ("in quo sane volumine vetusto"); he believed that this long panegyric on the king had been written in the latter's lifetime ("favor Ethelstani adhuc viventis").<sup>20</sup> The poem patterns the greatness of the English king on that of Charlemagne; its plan indicates the influence of Einhard's *Vita Karoli Magni Imperatoris*. One of the longest stories summarized by William and given just before his poetic excerpt on the Battle of Brunanburg (937), concerns the great gifts sent from France to King Athelstan when Duke Hugh the Great (wrongly called King Hugh) sought the hand of the king's sister. The actual marriage took place in 926. Among the holy relics sent to the devout king were fragments of the Cross and the Crown of Thorns; also a Holy Nail and the Passion Lance itself. Of these last two we read:

18. *The Works of Liudprand of Cremona*, tr. by F. A. Wright, London, 1939, p. 160, from the *Antapodosis*, Bk. IV, ch. 25. After the surrender of the holy lance by King Rodolf of Burgundy to Henry I the Fowler, it became part of the regalia of German kings and emperors. In the eleventh century it or some substitute was known as the Lance of St. Mauricius. Cf. A. Hofmeister, *Die heilige Lanze, ein Abzeichen des alten Reich*, Breslau, 1908; Walther Holzmänn, *König Heinrich und die heilige Lanze*, Bonn, Universitäts Verlag, 1947; L. H. Loomis, "The Holy Relics of Charlemagne and King Athelstan: the Lances of Longinus and of St. Mauricius," *Speculum*, XXV (October, 1950), 437-456.

19. GRA, ed. William Stubbs, 2 vols., Rolls Series, London, 1887, I, 149-152. In his editorial comment, II, lxi-lxv, a passage singularly missed by later commentators, Stubbs fully recognized the antiquity of the poem. The latest and most authoritative English historian to accept the poem is Professor F. M. Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England*, Oxford, 1943, pp. 313, 335, 686, 688. My article in *Speculum* sets forth further historical and literary reasons for this date, also evidence for the poem's concept of Athelstan as an "English Charlemagne."

20. Though William, in the same passage, deprecated the style of the panegyric, the care with which he quoted and summarized its contents shows that in it, as Stubbs (GRA, II, lxi) has remarked, William thought that "he had found a treasure."

ensem Constantini magni, in quo litteris aureis nomen antiqui possessoris legebatur: in capulo quoque super crassas auri laminas clavum ferreum affixum cerneret, unum ex quatuor quos Judaica factio Domini corporis aptarat supplicio; lanceam Caroli Magni, quam imperator invictissimus, contra Saracenos exercitum ducens, siquando in hostem vibrabat, nunquam nisi victor abibat: ferebatur eadem esse quae, Dominico lateri centurionis manu impacta, pretiosi vulneris hiatu Paradisum miseris mortalibus aperuit (*GRA*, I, 150).

Whatever the audacity of the tenth-century poet in making these assertions, it is certain that his belief that Athelstan had once possessed a relic known as the Lance is confirmed by an Anglo-Saxon record dating from about 1030 which lists this relic among those given by the king to Exeter Cathedral.<sup>21</sup> This document authenticates the relic at least to the extent of proving that such a relic was at Exeter in the early eleventh century and was still supposed to have been given by Athelstan. What is even more important for our present inquiry, however, is the fact that the Latin poem not only tells how Athelstan came to receive the relic, but offers a probable written source, preserved in book form to William of Malmesbury's own day, for the group of ideas brought together in the Lance passage of the *Roland*. From William's prose summary we see (1) that the Latin poem associated the Passion Lance with Charlemagne; (2) made it a victory weapon; (3) connected it with joy since it opened Paradise to mortals; and (4) told of a golden-hilted sword inset with a relic of the Passion.

These four distinctive ideas, unknown or unrelated elsewhere, anticipate those in the Lance passage of the *Roland*, a passage which more than one scholar, like T. A. Jenkins in his edition of the poem (N. Y., 1924, page 181, note), has thought to be peculiarly the poet's own. The latter used the ideas creatively, not slavishly: he made the Lance tip, not the Nail, the sword's inset Passion relic. The greatest emperor must have the holiest relic. The poet omitted here specific mention of that Paradise which elsewhere his Turpin promises so freely to the dying warriors of France (verses 1135, 1522, 2197), but now that we have the clue to his thought, can we doubt that it was the description of the Lance as opening Paradise and its eternal joy that inspired the French poet's beautiful symbolic name for Joyeuse, the sword that held the relic, or for the war cry that commemorated it? Can we still suppose that it was Charlemagne's joy in possessing the Lance relic that French barons were not to forget when they shouted "Munjoie"? In other stories of Charlemagne's acquisition of other Passion relics, stories to be considered shortly, their twelfth-

21. For mention of the Passion Spear in the Anglo-Saxon and twelfth-century Latin record, both originally documents of Exeter Cathedral but now at the Bodleian, see Max Förster, "Zur Geschichte des Reliquienkultus in Altengland," *Sitzungsberichte der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, phil.-hist. Abt., Munich, 1943, VIII, pp. 69 (6), 81 (6); for Förster's discussion of the dates of these manuscripts, see pp. 39 ff.



century authors said nothing of joy; they represented the emperor as receiving the relics with blinding tears of contrition, with utter humility. In the *Roland*, where relic and sword and cry are so palpably linked together, was it not by the thought of something not of this, but of the celestial, world? Was it not in the poet's mind, as he must have supposed it to be in the minds of his contemporaries, that the Lance relic was a symbol of hope, of joy? Well might men follow the joyous sword that held the relic! well might they shout, on whatsoever darkest hill, in whatsoever saddest moment of human defeat, their triumphant affirmation of faith, of joy to come, "Monjoie! Monjoie!"

A remarkable confirmation of this association of holy joy with the Passion Lance is to be found in that same continuation of Chrétien's *Perceval* to which we have already referred. Gawain has come to the Grail Castle; he sees the Bleeding Lance and asks why it bleeds. An old man identifies it as the Lance with which Longinus struck God's Son and speaks of it as follows:

"Or vos dirai premierement De la lance al comencement, Le grant damage et la dolor Qu'en avint et la grant honor,	13464
Ensi com Diez l'ot establi, Dont nos somes sain et gari. . . . et nos en joie irons,	13489
Ses sans ert nostre raençons. La grant joie ne vos puis dire, Que nos gaaigna cil cops, sire."	

Here again, as in the *Roland*, a poet speaks of the Holy Lance in terms of *joie* and *honor*.

Since the Athelstan panegyric explains then, as does nothing else, the group of four related ideas in the *Roland*'s account of Joyeuse, the date of the Latin poem becomes a matter of special importance. Unless we continue to ignore William of Malmesbury's account of his ancient source and his reputation as one of the most scrupulous of medieval historians, likewise the internal evidence of the poem itself as shown by his summary and long quotations, and finally the opinion of such eminent authorities in Anglo-Saxon history as Bishop Stubbs and today of Professor F. M. Stenton, we must accept the panegyric as a tenth-century poem. The author of the Lance passage in the *Roland* either borrowed from it the four related ideas or took them from William himself.<sup>22</sup> Since few scholars today would admit even the possibility that the *Roland* poet wrote after 1125,

22. William elsewhere (*GRA*, II, 302) referred to the "cantilena Rollandi." Bédier (*La Chanson de Roland, commentée*, pp. 57-59) thought the historian alluded to songs, possibly in Latin, older than the *Chanson de Roland*, which Bédier here dated between 1098-1100. Fawtier (*op. cit.*, pp. 77-80) argued that William's reference concerned the *Roland* itself.

we must accept the former alternative. The *Roland* borrowed from the panegyric.

It seems important here to call attention to an almost unknown French tradition that may well have been the starting point for the Carolingian association given to the Lance relic. Though references to this relic, apart from its supposed discovery at Antioch, are exceedingly rare before the thirteenth century, one record from the once great Carolingian monastery of St. Riquier in Ponthieu still exists. The monk Hariulf states that he finished his Chronicle of the abbey's history in 1088,<sup>23</sup> but for that Chronicle, of course, he used much earlier sources. One of these, in the opinion of his learned editor, M. Ferdinand Lot (page xxviii) was the ninth-century *Translatio* of the monk Jeremiah, who was also treasurer of the abbey. In this Jeremiah reported that when Ponthieu was ravaged by invaders (the Danes of 879-883, according to M. Lot), he was ordered to carry some of the most precious relics of St. Riquier to Sens for safekeeping. Among them was that "summitas acuminis lanceae, de qua ejusdem Domini latus pro nostra salute jam mortui manu militis fuit apertum, unde etiam Ecclesiae sacramenta fluxerunt."<sup>24</sup> This relic had previously been mentioned in Hariulf's Chronicle (page 100) as one of those given to St. Riquier by Charlemagne's son, Louis the Pious (d. 840). The Jeremiah story, as reported by Hariulf, has some obvious errors and the original *Translatio* is lost. But M. Lot, after careful consideration of all these matters, had no doubt that the *Translatio* did once exist and that in it there was an allusion to this and other holy relics brought to, not by, the Emperor Louis from Constantinople.<sup>25</sup> M. Lot said nothing, however, of the exceptional interest of this early allusion to a relic of the Holy Lance as having been in France and in the possession of Charlemagne's son. So far as I know, this relic has not been mentioned in connection with the *Chanson de Roland*, yet here, it would seem, was the possible beginning of a French Carolingian tradition about the Holy Lance; here, too, as in the *chanson de geste*, there was mention only of the tip of the Lance.

23. *Hariulf, chronique de Saint-Riquier*, ed. Ferdinand Lot, Paris, 1894, pp. xvii ff., 283. Hariulf's first redaction of 1088 ended with Abbot Gervin, Bk. IV. Changes in this last book were made between 1096-1105.

24. *Ibid.*, p. 142. No later mention of this particular relic is known save in accounts palpably derived from Hariulf. Cf. *Speculum*, XXV (1950), notes 43, 44.

25. *Hariulf*, p. 100. Lot (*ibid.*, n. 4) thought that Hariulf, in saying the relics mentioned had been brought by Louis from Constantinople, had perhaps been influenced by some legend of Charlemagne's fabulous journey to the East. L. A. Vigneras, "L'Abbaye de Charroux et la légende du Pèlerinage," *RR*, XXXII (1941), 121-128, has argued that a legend of this journey, first mentioned in Italy in the late tenth century, was known in France at Charroux before 1082. Hariulf may have been influenced by it in saying that the relics were brought by, rather than to, Louis, but it was a change that might easily have been made in entire independence of the Italian story. Bédier (*Légendes*, IV, 131, 133) suggested that the legend, when it appeared in France, was a re-invention; on p. 128, n. 3, he called attention to the statement of Abbot Angilbert of St. Riquier (d. 814) that holy relics were received by Charlemagne "de Constantinopoli vel Hierosolimis" (*Hariulf*, p. 62).

From the account of the monk Jeremiah, we learn that this precious relic was taken to Sens in the ninth century. What happened to it then? I have suggested in the *Speculum* article previously referred to (note 18) that an answer is to be found in the political circumstances of the early tenth century. For it was then that the all-powerful Duke Hugh the Great, father of Hugh Capet, might have had access, through the compliant Archbishop Gautier of Sens, even to the holy treasures of Sens. Both men were in violent opposition to the Carolingian dynasty of Charles the Simple; in 923 Duke Hugh had helped in battle to defeat Charles, and Gautier had crowned the new usurper, Raoul of Burgundy.<sup>26</sup> In 926, when Duke Hugh sought the hand of Athelstan's sister, he sent from France, according to the Latin panegyric, a prodigious gift of secular and religious treasures; two of the holy relics were said to have belonged to Charlemagne. Perhaps at the time such things had for the ruthless duke chiefly an export value. The gift was not reported in France; at least we hear of no recorded outcry until the thirteenth century when Aubri de Trois Fontaines read the story in William of Malmesbury's *Chronicle*. Aubri thought it impossible that such treasures should ever have been sent out of France and all for the sake of one woman!<sup>27</sup>

The evidence so far considered leads us to think that there was in France in the ninth century, according to the monk Jeremiah, a relic of the Passion Lance which had been given to St. Riquier by Charlemagne's youngest son; in the tenth century, a Passion Lance, supposed to have belonged to Charlemagne, was reported, in an Anglo-Latin poem, to have been sent from France to the devout King Athelstan; in an early eleventh-century list of relics at Exeter Cathedral, a piece of the Passion Lance was recorded as the gift of Athelstan; before 1088 the chronicler Hariulf had retold Jeremiah's ancient story. The Latin poem, as summarized by William of Malmesbury, offers a specific source for four related and otherwise unexplained ideas in the Lance passage of the *Roland*. With the exception of the Exeter record, all the others connect the Lance relic with Carolingian tradition. They have, therefore, considerably more pertinence for the Lance passage than the Antioch relic which alone has figured in previous discussions of the *Roland*. The Antioch Lance was, of course, always devoid of the slightest Carolingian association.

#### THE ANTIOCH LANCE

On June 14, 1098, the "Lancea Salvatoris" was, according to contemporary reports, discovered at Antioch. In 1902 that discovery became especially important in *Roland* scholarship. In an archaeologically unsound

26. Ph. Lauer, *Robert I et Raoul de Bourgogne, rois de France, 923-936*, Paris, 1910, pp. 12-15. See index for Hugues le Grand. Cf. also Joseph Calmette, *Le Monde féodal*, Paris, 1937, p. 148; and p. 144 for a useful note on the movement of relics in the ninth century.

27. *Mon. Ger. Hist.* SS., XXIII, 773: "Mirum, si ita est, pro una muliere hec omnia a Francia fuisse alienata."

book on the Bayeux Embroidery, Marignan<sup>28</sup> asserted that the Lance passage alone would serve to date the poem after 1098. For him, as for other writers, alike eager to find in the poem signs of the influence of the Crusades, the immense popular enthusiasm aroused by the discovery best accounted for the poet's appropriation of the idea of such a relic. In his severe review of Marignan's book, Gaston Paris (*Romania*, XXI [1902], 411) came to an opposite conclusion. After the discovery, he thought, "on ne pouvait songer à placer la pointe de la sainte Lance dans le pommeau de l'épée de Charlemagne." The poem must, therefore, have been composed before 1098. This conflict of essentially subjective opinion brought the problem no nearer to solution.

A more factual character was given to the discussion in 1927 in Bédier's *Commentaires on the Roland* (pages 42-43). He attacked Gaston Paris' theory with vigor. Relying on the disconcerting evidence offered by Fulcher of Chartres and Raoul de Caen, Bédier argued that after the fatal ordeal by fire to which Peter Bartholomew (d. 1099), who discovered the relic, had submitted himself, faith in it was lost and it soon disappeared from public view. Soon after Peter's death, therefore, "un poète pouvait donc avec tranquillité se permettre . . . d'enchâsser la pointe dans . . . Joyeuse" (page 42). A note on the same page added: "Voici une justification amusante de ce dire. Guillaume de Malmesbury affirme sans sourciller que Hugues Capet possédait la lance de Charlemagne que ferebatur esse lancea que lateri Christi fuit infixa. . . . Sur quoi Aubry de Trois Fontaines (*Mon. Ger. Hist. Script.*, XXIII, 773) proteste que c'est impossible: 'quia . . . illa lancea primum in Anthiocha fuit inventa.' D'où il résulte qu'il tenait pour authentique la relique d'Antioche, lui qui écrivait un siècle et demi après l'aventure du prêtre Barthélemy, mais que Guillaume de M. n'attachait à ladite relique aucune importance, lui qui écrivait vingt-cinq ans seulement après."

In these remarks, of course, it is evident that Bédier, like so many other scholars before him, had paid no attention to William's own account of his ancient source or to Stubbs's complete acceptance of that source, an acceptance still further confirmed by more recent historians. Since William was simply recounting what he had found in a tenth-century poem, in no wise can it be said that he was so affected by disbelief in the Antioch relic that he could, "sans sourciller," assign the Lance relic to Charlemagne's possession.

Since William's supposed attitude to the relic was linked by Bédier to that of the author of the *Chanson de Roland*, since both writers were supposed to have been so informed about the discrediting of the Antioch

28. A. Marignan, *La Tapisserie de Bayeux, étude archéologique et critique*, Paris, 1902, p. 154. For recent adverse comment on this book and a good bibliographical note, see Eric Maclagan, *The Bayeux Tapestry*, King Penguin Books, 3rd ed., 1949, pp. 24, 30. Marignan, in attempting to date the *Roland* after 1150, said that gonfanons, frequently referred to in the poem, were not used until about that date. For ninth-century illuminations showing the use of gonfanons, see A. Boinet, *La Miniature carolingienne*, Paris, 1915, plates CXV, CXLV.

Lance, we must pause to consider this assumption too. We do not know exactly when or where the French poet was writing, but William was writing at Malmesbury before 1125. What of his knowledge of Raoul de Caen and Fulcher of Chartres, the only two writers cited by Bédier for evidence of current scepticism about the Antioch relic? Raoul's *Gesta Tancredi*, written mainly between 1112–1118, survives in only one manuscript (Brussels, Royal Library, Cod. MS 5374), the author's own working copy.<sup>29</sup> Its date, the lack of any sign of early diffusion, make it altogether improbable that a copy of this work, still unfinished in 1130, could have reached Malmesbury before 1125. There is no evidence that it was known to William or to the French poet. The *Gesta Tancredi*<sup>30</sup> itself, in likening Robert of Flanders and Hugh of Vermandois at Dorylaeum to Roland and Oliver, made one of the well-known early allusions to the *Roland*.<sup>31</sup> Although Raoul de Caen's account of the discovery of the Antioch Lance, of the discrediting of its finder by his ordeal and death, was by all odds the most devastating, the most violently partisan attack on the authenticity of the relic, there is no reason to believe it was known to either one of the writers with whom we are here concerned.

For Fulcher of Chartres the case is, at first glimpse, altogether different.<sup>32</sup> William of Malmesbury (*GRA*, II, 434) explicitly refers to his work. As Stubbs (II, cxix) noted, Fulcher was William's chief source for his account of the First Crusade, an account in which, however, William made no reference to the famous Antioch discovery. Stubbs remarked, in a footnote on page cxix: "It is possible that William knew Fulcher through the abridgment, *Gesta Francorum Obsidentium*," or (page cxxv) the *Gesta Francorum Expugnantium Jerusalem*. Stubbs here called attention to several stories reported by William which did not appear in Fulcher's original account but did appear in these later redactions. For us it is important to note that in these versions Fulcher's account of the Lance is so abbreviated as to be of no importance. Upon analysis it is very difficult to believe that Fulcher's original account, always brief at best and somewhat reluctant

29. I rely on Bédier's own precise account of this manuscript (*La Chanson de Roland, commentée*, p. 56, n. 2). He noted that certain leaves, in Raoul's hand, show that Raoul was still at work on this MS as late as 1130, a date to which these leaves refer. The MS cannot then have been out of Raoul's possession.

30. All allusions to the Latin chronicles of the First Crusade are to the *Recueil des historiens des Croisades: historiens occidentaux*, 5 vols., Paris, 1844–1855 (= *Recueil*). For English translations, accompanied by valuable historical notes, see August Krey, *The First Crusade: the Accounts of Eye-Witnesses and Participants*, Princeton, University Press, 1921. Though Raoul de Caen was not present at the discovery of the Antioch Lance or at the ordeal of Peter Bartholomew, his vivid account of these episodes (*Recueil*, III, 676, 682), from a violently partisan, Norman point of view, was included, because of its interest, in Krey's translations.

31. *Recueil*, III, 627; cf. Fawtier, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

32. *Recueil*, III, 311–485; for the Lance story, pp. 344–345. The first redaction of Fulcher's work was composed between 1109–1133, the second between 1118–1124, according to H. Hagenmeyer in his edition of Fulcher's *Historia Hierosolymitana*, Heidelberg, 1913, p. 48. William of Malmesbury must then have used the second redaction since he referred to an event of 1123 (*GRA*, II, 452), also noted by Fulcher.

in tone,<sup>33</sup> much less these still briefer later redactions, could have had the immediate and overwhelming effect which Bédier supposed.

In contrast to these two sceptical accounts, there is massive evidence as to the early diffusion of sympathetic accounts of the relic.<sup>34</sup> The Anonymous who wrote between 1099-1101 his *Gesta Francorum et Aliorum Hierosolymitanorum*,<sup>35</sup> gave a long, detailed, joyously convinced description of the finding of what was to him this true relic; as is well recognized, almost every other account of the First Crusade was based on his,<sup>36</sup> and in almost every one the story of the Lance was related with equal sympathy. Of one account, written shortly before 1107 by Robert the Monk, over eighty manuscripts survive, a convincing indication of its popularity and diffusion.<sup>37</sup> Abbot Guibert of Nogent, writing between 1104 and 1121, not only borrowed much from the Anonymous but in his version of the Lance episode<sup>38</sup> added the story of Peter Bartholomew's ordeal and interpreted its fatal outcome, as the passionately credulous Provençal, Raymond of Aguilers, had done before him, not as a result of the burns on Peter's body, but of the wounds he had received from the multitude who believed in him and wished to touch him. Guibert asked tauntingly if Fulcher, who was not present at the discovery of the Lance or at the ordeal, should have more influence than those who were? "Shall the shrewdness of Fulcher, the priest, now have more importance than the characters (? *ingeniis*) of so many careful witnesses who were present when the Lance was found, that Fulcher, who, while our people were being imperilled by hunger at Antioch, feasted himself and made holiday at Edessa?" Alto-

33. The mildness of Fulcher's tone may be judged from his conclusion: "Since everybody had venerated that Lance for the honor and love of God, after judgment was thus accomplished [by Peter's ordeal], those who formerly appeared credulous of this culprit remained incredulous. Nevertheless, Count Raymond [of Toulouse] kept it a long time after that" (translated by Martha McGinty, *Fulcher of Chartres, Chronicle of the First Crusade*, Book I, Philadelphia, Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 1941, p. 49). In his first redaction, Fulcher combined in one brief narrative the discovery and the ordeal, two events separated in time by about ten months. In later redactions the two stories were separated and condensed. Cf. *Recueil*, III, 502, 507.

34. Cf. H. Hagenmeyer, *La Chronologie de la première Croisade*, Paris, 1902, pp. 60-61, 167-169, 220, 224, for the bibliography of the Lance episode. Krey (*op. cit.*, p. 296, n. 22) remarked on the baffling silence of the Anonymous and of other writers who were doubtless present at the ordeal. They had accepted the authenticity of the Lance at the time of its discovery. Since Krey's one volume translated these writers but lacks an index, I give the following page references to accounts of the Lance: Anonymous, pp. 174-176; Raymond of Aguilers, pp. 176-182, 185-188, 198-202, 210-212, 228-233 (ordeal), 236-237; letters from the clergy and princes, pp. 190, 191-192, 193, 276. See above, note 30.

35. *Histoire anonyme de la première Croisade*, éd. et tr. par L. Bréhier, Paris, 1924, pp. 132-135, 146-147.

36. *Ibid.*, pp. xii-xvi; Krey, *op. cit.*, pp. 7, 282, 296; Beatrice Lees, *Anonymi Gesta Francorum*, Oxford, 1924, pp. xi-xii.

37. Krey, *op. cit.*, p. 13; Bréhier (*op. cit.*, p. xxi) spoke of "une centaine de manuscrits."

38. *Recueil*, IV, 252. Krey (*op. cit.*, p. 296, n. 23), in commenting on Guibert, noted the severity of the rebuke to Fulcher which is quoted above. I am indebted to Dr. Albert Friend for his help in solving here and elsewhere some of the difficulties of Guibert's involved style.



gether, so far as the first part of the twelfth century gives evidence, the whole balance of record in the number and diffusion of sympathetic accounts of the discovery, accounts which regularly omit or abbreviate mention of the ordeal, makes one doubt Bédier's conclusion. The scepticism felt at Antioch in 1099 did not permeate the West. The French clerics who, for the most part, were the historians of the First Crusade, were not interested in telling about the discrediting of a holy relic which practically all of them had accepted at the time of its discovery.

Since Bédier's argument concerning immediate and widespread Western scepticism about the Antioch Lance seems then untenable, we return to Gaston Paris' theory. As Bédier himself admitted, if faith in the relic did prevail in the West, then such a reference to the Passion Lance as occurs in the *Roland* would have seemed "presque sacrilège," for Charlemagne could not have possessed what had so recently been found at Antioch. The poet must, therefore, have written before, not after, 1098. In the phraseology of today any writer, for a long time after that date, would have been inhibited by the very fame of the Antioch relic. This was Gaston Paris' implicit argument; he gave no actual evidence for it. Yet he of all men, in 1902, was familiar with three accounts which establish, better than any amount of commentary, the fact of that inhibition among actual twelfth-century writers. In these stories, of widely different character and purpose but all dating from that century and all three concerned with the same matter, *i.e.* Charlemagne's acquisition of Passion Relics, the Lance was conspicuous by its absence. Yet it was surely as holy, as precious as were the other Passion Relics, and the authors of these accounts were surely no less audacious than was the author of the panegyric to Athelstan. Yet something constrained the three twelfth-century writers and we can only believe it was the fame of the Antioch relic that forced each one of them to omit the Lance. In commenting on one of these narratives, the *Descriptio Qualiter Karolus Magnus Clavum et Coronam Domini a Constantinopoli Aquis Grani Detulerit*,<sup>39</sup> Professor Ronald Walpole has recently observed: "The discovery of the Lance in Antioch had a tremendous effect on the whole of Western Christendom. . . . It is easy to imagine why the author of the *Descriptio*, at a time when the chroniclers of the First Crusade were eagerly describing Pierre Barthélemy's experience, forbore to include the Lance among the relics which Charlemagne was said to have brought back from Constantinople."<sup>40</sup> In that other account of Charlemagne's

39. *Descriptio*, ed. G. Rauschen, *Die Legende des Karl des Grossen*, Leipzig, 1890; for Latin MSS of the *Descriptio*, see J. Nothomb, *R*, LVI (1930), 191-211. Bédier (*Légendes*, IV, 125) dated the *Descriptio* shortly before 1124. See the following note.

40. "Charlemagne and Roland," *Univ. of California Publ. in Modern Philology*, XXI (1944), 416; pages 387, 396-402 give the most recent and authoritative study of the *Descriptio*. In Walpole's later work in the same series, "Philip Mouskés and the Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle," XXVI (1947), 362, he remarked: "The questions of the date [of the *Descriptio*], its origin, authorship, and of its relation to the epic poem on the same theme, *Le Pèlerinage de Charlemagne*, have only been given very tentative answers." Cf. also pp. 354, 365-367, 398, 400.

fabulous journey to the East, the merry, mocking, "Baroque epic," as it has been called, the *Pèlerinage de Charlemagne* (ca. 1109-1150),<sup>41</sup> the Lance is likewise omitted. It is also missing from the *Fierabras* (ca. 1170),<sup>42</sup> which tells how Charlemagne, not by Eastern journey and gift, but by grim warfare, acquired the Passion Relics looted by the Saracens from Rome. Never, in any twelfth-century version of these stories, did the Lance appear. When it was first added, in two versions of the *Descriptio* that dated from about the middle of the thirteenth century, it was plainly an addition that had nothing to do with any older form of this story.

#### THE LANCE RELIC OF MOUSKÉS AND THE KARLAMAGNUS SAGA

A continental French version of the *Descriptio* appeared in the *Chronique rimée*<sup>43</sup> of Philip Mouskés who was writing about 1240. This well-to-do layman of Tournai was so in love with Carolingian story that he devoted about a third of his chronicle to it. We now know, thanks to Professor Walpole's illuminating study, *Philip Mouskés and the Pseudo-Turpin Chronicle*, that Mouskés, unscholarly and pedestrian as he was, did not use Latin but French versions of that narrative. Seven of these French versions, the earliest dating from about 1200, are known.<sup>44</sup> About that time Pierre de Beauvais made a French translation of the *Descriptio*; the two translations were sometimes copied together; sometimes the French *Turpin* was interpolated by an abbreviated version of Pierre's *Descriptio*.<sup>45</sup> Professor Walpole<sup>46</sup> thinks it was some one of these Pierre versions that Mouskés used. Whatever his source, we can feel sure that it, like all known antecedent Latin and French versions of the *Descriptio*, did not include the Lance. The Lance of Longinus was, however, assuredly in Mouskés' own mind when he came to his version of Charlemagne's acquisition of the Passion Relics; he had already, as the following selections show, twice referred to Longinus and his Lance (verses 6785, 10776). When he added that Lance to the usual *Descriptio* list of relics (verses 11454 ff.), the repetition of his earlier twice-used *costé : tasté* rhyme indicates that here, as so often elsewhere, he was merely repeating himself.

41. *Le Pèlerinage de Charlemagne*, ed. Anna J. Cooper, Paris, 1925. For the most recent bibliography, cf. Urban Holmes, "The Pèlerinage de Charlemagne and William of Malmesbury," *Symposium* (Nov. 1946), p. 75. On p. 78 he observed that of the thirteen relics listed in the *Pèlerinage*, only five correspond to those listed in the *Descriptio*, i.e., the Arm of St. Simeon, a Nail of the Passion, a bit of the Crown of Thorns, the sudarium of Christ, the Virgin's shift.

42. *Fierabras*, ed. Kroeber et Servois, Paris, 1860. Bédier (*Légendes*, IV, 164) pointed out that the author of *Fierabras* borrowed from the *Descriptio* the miracle of certain relics hanging in the air. Cf. Urban Holmes, *History of Old French Literature*, Chapel Hill, N. C., 1937, p. 80, for the so-called "cycle of the relics."

43. Ed. par Baron de Reiffenberg, 2 vols., Brussels, 1845. Quotations are from this edition. For the date of the *Chronique*, see Walpole, *Mouskés*, p. 428, n. 18.

44. *Ibid.*, p. 364.

45. Walpole, *Charlemagne and Roland*, pp. 397-400.

46. Walpole, *Mouskés*, p. 428.



I, 269, verses 6785 ff.

Tot autresi com ot Longis,  
Ki del cop ne fu pas engis  
Dont li ot perciel le costé;  
Et quant il ot le sanc tasté  
Ki parmi la lance couloit, . . .

I, 417, verses 10776 ff.

Longis le feri el costé,  
Et, quant il ot le sanc tasté,  
A ses ious touça, s'ot vé  
Qu'il onques mais n'avait éue.

I, 441, verses 11454 ff.

Encore ot Karles moult grignor  
Sanctuaire del vrai signor;  
Ce fu del sanc ki s'espandi  
Quant Longius l'ot ens el costé  
Feru de la lance et tasté.  
Et de cele lance méisme  
Ki fu gloriouse et saintisme,  
Ot il le fier et s'ot del fust  
Dont nus malades qui la fust  
N'ot enferté, puis qu'il touça  
Al saintuaire n'aprocha.

It is generally believed that Mouskés did not know the Oxford *Roland* but that he drew extensively on some lost version.<sup>47</sup> His lines on the Lance indicate no debt to the Lance passage known to us. He borrowed from himself what he had to say about Longinus; for the rest he seems to have added, on his own initiative, the Lancehead, like so many other things, to his wildly expanded list of the relics Charlemagne acquired in the East.

The second version of the *Descriptio* to contain the Lance relic was in still another huge compilation of Carolingian story. The *Karlamagnus Saga*,<sup>48</sup> written in Old Norwegian prose, drew its various stories from manuscripts written in England and for the most part in Anglo-Norman. The first compilation in nine branches, represented by manuscripts A and a, is supposed to have been made before 1250, in the time of the famous King Hákon Hákonarson (1217-1265), a ruler who cultivated close diplomatic, commercial, and cultural relations with England; the second version, distinguished chiefly by the addition of one new branch (II) and many expansions and small changes and represented by manuscripts B and b, must be dated after 1287, possibly after 1300.<sup>49</sup> In Unger's edition, the only one in print of the whole *Saga*, there are ten branches. They make up a cyclic collection of stories about Charlemagne from his youth to his death.

In two of these branches there are allusions to Charlemagne's possession of the Lance relic. The first comes in Branch I, chapter 50 (Unger, page 44), in an account of Charlemagne's eastern journey based on some French version of the *Descriptio*. In a second version of the same story in Branch X, chapter 1 (Unger, page 547) based, so the *Saga* says, on Vincent of

47. *Ibid.*, p. 406. Cf. R. C. Bates, "Mouskés Seven Centuries Ago," *Essays in Honor of Albert Feuillerat, Yale Romanic Studies*, XXII (1943), 33, n. 11; F. Hasselmann, *Ueber die Quellen. . . von Mousket*, Göttingen, 1916, pp. 44-48, 58.

48. *Karlamagnus Saga*, ed. C. Unger, Christiania, 1860. Henry G. Leach (*Angevin England and Scandinavia*, Cambridge, Mass., 1921, pp. 238-254) summarized the *Saga* and commented on its sources. For a French summary, see Gaston Paris, *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des Chartes*, Paris, 1864, pp. 89-123.

49. Nearly all comment on the date of the two redactions has derived from Unger's own brief comment, pp. iii-iv. Cf. Paris, *op. cit.*, p. 90; Leach, *op. cit.*, p. 238; H. M. Smyser and F. Magoun, *Survivals in Old Norwegian*, Baltimore, 1941, pp. v-vi.

Beauvais, there is, as in all traditional versions, no mention of the Lance. Nor, to judge from all comparable texts, can there have been any mention of it in the French version used by the compiler of Branch I. There was none in the French version made for Renaud, Count of Boulogne, who came in exile to England in 1212 and may have brought this version with him.<sup>50</sup> But the Norse translator interpolated into whatever source he used, a passage taken from the *Roland*, a fact long ago pointed out by Jules Coulet.<sup>51</sup> From his French translation of the *Saga's* Norse version of the *Descriptio*, I quote the Lance passage. It comes just after Charlemagne's refusal in Constantinople of rich treasures. He says he would prefer to have some relics of the Passion. Thereupon the Greek emperor gave him

la pointe de la Lance (de Notre Seigneur) qui lui avait percé le flanc, et la lance de saint Mercure. . . . Charlemagne garda pour lui la lance (i.e. of St. Mercurius) et la pointe de la Lance. Il les fit placer dans le pommeau de son épée. Pour cela il l'appela Joyeuse (Giovisse) en raison du don qu'il lui avait fait. De là vient que tous ses chevaliers crient Montjoie (Mungeoy), quand ils s'excitent au combat (Coulet, pages 132 f.).

Coulet (pages 135, 159) was right in noting that the Lance relic, the names Giovisse and Mungeoy, were mentioned in the same terms, with the same details, that they have in the Oxford *Roland*. It is a plain borrowing, a plain interpolation, in this Norse *Descriptio*. Together the two texts, the French poem and a French *Descriptio*, would account wholly for the passage quoted from the *Saga*, were it not for that one odd additional relic, the Lance of St. Mercurius.

This saint<sup>52</sup> was altogether unknown to the authors of the *Roland* and the *Descriptio*, but not to the compilers of the *Saga*. In Branch IV, chapter 72, a story was told of him that was drawn from a legend of the First Crusade,<sup>53</sup> in various chronicles recording the legend his name and that of St. Mauricius were sometimes interchanged. This precedent may have been known to the Norse compiler of Branch I, but there can be no doubt that he found the name of St. Mauricius in another source used by him

50. Walpole, *Charlemagne and Roland*, p. 407.

51. Jules Coulet, *Études sur le voyage de Charlemagne en Orient*, Montpellier, 1907, p. 135.

52. Coulet's remarks (p. 157) about St. Mercurius were wholly conjectural. For an admirable study of the early history of the legend, see Stéphane Binon, *Essai sur le cycle de Saint-Mercure*, Paris, 1937 (Bibl. de l'Ecole des Hautes Etudes, Sciences Religieuses, LIII, 1-144). For the later history, see my article, "The St. Mercurius Legend in Medieval England and Norse Saga," in *Philologica, The Malone Anniversary Studies*, Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, 1949, pp. 132-143.

53. *Karlamagnus Saga*, ed. Unger, Branch IV, p. 255. In this Norse version of the *Chanson d'Aspremont*, the three saints, Georgius, Mercurius, Demetrius, come to the help of Oddgeir and Rollant. Cf. Roelf van Waard, *Etudes sur l'origine et la formation de la Chanson d'Aspremont*, Groningen, 1937, pp. 158, 183. The story came from a legendary episode of the First Crusade. Cf. *Histoire anonyme*, ed. Bréhier, p. 154. In some accounts of this episode the names of Mauricius and Mercurius are interchanged. Cf. Binon, *op. cit.*, p. 99, n. 1; L. H. Loomis, *Philologica*, n. 39.

and that he exchanged the two names. This other source was the story of the Gifts to Athelstan, the one story which not only associated the Passion Lance with Charlemagne but likewise the *vexillum* or bannered lance of St. Mauricius:<sup>54</sup>

vexillum Mauricii beatissimi martyris, . . . quo idem rex [Charlemagne] in bello magno Hispano quamlibet infestos. . . inimicorum cuneos dirumpere, et in fugam solitus erat cogere (*GRA*, I, 150).

The belief that it was the Gift Story which here inspired the Norse redactor to give Charlemagne a second lance relic, is confirmed by another borrowing in Branch VIII. This gives the *Saga's* version of the whole *Roland*, from a source which Bédier (*Légendes*, III, 359) thought close to O. In the *Saga's* lines corresponding to O, *laisse* CLXXXIII, we find not only the Passion Lance but also another Passion Relic, this time the Holy Nail. I quote from Koschwitz's careful German translation of this Norse *Roland*.<sup>55</sup>

Der König legte seine Rüstung nicht ab; er stellte sein Schild zu seinem Haupte und war in der Brünne und mit dem guten Schwerte umgürtet welches Jouis heisst; das war mit 30 Farben an jeden Tage; und er hat einen Nagel, womit unser Herr an das Kreuz geheftet wurde, in dem Knaufe des Schwertes, und der oberste Theil war ein Stück von der Lanze des Herrn, womit er erwundet wurde.

The addition of this Holy Nail to what must have been the somewhat overcrowded sword hilt of Joyeuse, proves that the Gift Story here, as before in Branch I, was known to the Norse compilers. It alone could have suggested both the second lance relic assigned to Charlemagne and also the Holy Nail for the sword hilt. The Gift Story was probably known to these compilers, as were most of the stories used by them, in some Anglo-Norman form,<sup>56</sup> some early translation of William of Malmesbury's famous Chronicle. From the last part of the twelfth century it would have been easy to have access to such a text or, of course, to the numerous copies of William's original Latin text. But there is no reason to suppose that the original panegyric to Athelstan, the poem shut away in the archives of Malmesbury, was ever used by the Norse compilers.

The case seems different, however, for the author of the *Chanson de Roland*, though doubtless those who date the poem after 1125<sup>57</sup> will deny

54. For further discussion of the *vexillum* of St. Mauricius, see above, note 18; also *Philologica*, p. 142.

55. E. Koschwitz, "Der altnordische *Roland*," *Romanische Studien*, ed. E. Boehmer, III (1878), 344. He was translating from Unger (pp. 526-527) who used ("Introduction," p. xxxvii), from p. 433, MS *a* as his basic text. Of the two MSS representing the first redaction of the *Saga*, A was written in the first half of the fourteenth century, *a* in the fifteenth century. Unger (p. ix) observed that the later redactor, represented by MSS B and *b*, was more careful in copying his original than were the copyists in A and *a*. I am greatly indebted to Professor Margaret Schlauch for her expert help in translating Unger's text and comments.

56. Cf. the Anglo-Norman version in *Le Livre de Reis de Engleterre*, ed. J. Glover, Rolls Series, London, 1865, p. 64. I hope to publish a much earlier version in connection with tracing the later history and influence of the story in England.

57. See *supra*, notes 1 and 2.

that difference. They will say that the (for them) twelfth-century poet, like the thirteenth-century Norse compilers, made an independent borrowing from William of Malmesbury's account of the Gifts to Athelstan. They may, perhaps, grant the veracity of the historian's reference to his ancient source and grant its survival at Malmesbury to his day, but they will be as reluctant to admit that the French poet, in the source of MS O, might have read it before 1100-1125, as they are to admit any other argument for dating the *Roland* before that time.

This is not the place to review again the arguments for that earlier dating. They can be found in the last article of Pauphilet (*supra*, note 2), in the *Roland, étude historique* (*op. cit.*) of M. Fawtier, and others. So far as the Lance passage is concerned, the present article has sought to show the untenableness of certain previous assertions about the influence of the First Crusade on the *Roland*, about the supposedly contemporary origin of war cries and gonfanons, and especially about the supposed immediate rejection, by Western writers, of the authenticity of the Antioch Lance. We return to the opinion of Gaston Paris that after 1098 it would, for a rather long period, have been impossible, as, in point of fact, three twelfth-century authors prove, for a writer to assign to Charlemagne possession of the Passion Lance. From 1098 to the mid-thirteenth century, we have found no writer concerned with stories of Charlemagne's acquisition of the Passion Relics who ventured to add the Lance to them. Fundamental, too, I think, to the true interpretation of the Lance passage, is the *Roland* poet's own insistence on the connection between the Lance relic and Joyeuse and Monjoie. No mount, no hill, howsoever holy, was in his thought, but only that joy of Paradise to which the Lance had opened the way. We have found some reason to believe that the history of a Passion Lance relic can be traced in France in the ninth and tenth centuries, and that this relic or some substitute for it was sent in 926 from France to England. It was this relic, which, according to the tenth-century panegyric to Athelstan, had once belonged to Charlemagne. This idea, together with three others associated with it in the Lance passage, the *Roland* poet seems to have borrowed at some time between 1066<sup>58</sup> and 1098. In that case, for all that he was, as Bédier<sup>59</sup> has so eloquently argued, "un Franc de France," he must at some time have been in England where alone he could have seen the Anglo-Latin poem.<sup>60</sup>

LAURA HIBBARD LOOMIS

*New York City*

58. Cf. *Roland*, vss. 2331-2332, where Roland recalls his conquest of England and Scotland. On this apparent reminiscence of the Norman Conquest, see Fawtier, *op. cit.*, p. 102.

59. Bédier, *La Chanson de Roland, commentée*, pp. 37-40.

60. Space does not permit us to do more than recall here that the Tuoldus whose name appears as a kind of signature to the *Roland* (vs. 4002), was identified in 1850 by Génin (pp. lxxi-lxxxv, *supra*, n. 15) as the sometime monk of Fécamp who became, by order of William the Conqueror, the abbot of Malmesbury, 1066-1069, and was then sent to defend Peterborough, as its abbot, against Hereward the Wake. Like all other identifications of Tuoldus, Génin's has been rejected, but it may be worth re-examination.

## NIGHT SCENES IN TIRSO DE MOLINA

*Fenecieron con la noche  
confusiones y pesares,  
y con el sol amanece  
la paz que a alegrarnos sale.<sup>1</sup>*

LUCINDA

*Y así, mi señor padre, te suplico,  
pues ese cuarto está desocupado  
que tiene en el jardín los dos balcones,  
permítas que en él tenga mi aposento,  
porque viene ese músico de noche,  
quiero decir, cuando se rompe el alba,  
y oírle me dará salud y vida.*

PADRE

*¿Qué músico, qué dices?*

LUCINDA

*Padre mío,  
un ruiseñor que viene cada noche. . .<sup>2</sup>*

A STUDY of night scenes in Tirso starts simply from one angle or on one plane. Statistics are duly gathered and recorded, and if we think that we are embarked on an analysis of dramatic technique we are vastly mistaken, for the very difficulties in gathering the statistics warn us that we are already on the slippery periphery of baroque art. Dramatic technique becomes almost a surface manifestation of polarities and complexes of levels and planes. Reality and unreality flit in and out, as opposites and partners, and our analysis seems to slip through our fingers. Each aspect leads to others and ideally should be studied always in terms of all the others; obviously all that we can do is to offer reiterated statements of interrelationships.

The one important deduction from the statistics<sup>3</sup> is the tendency for Act I to open at night, and for all three acts to close at night, in increasing ratio, with Act III receiving special frequency. In fact, Tirso's attitude

1. *Los balcones de Madrid*, BAE, V, 571 c.

2. Lope, *El ruiseñor de Sevilla*, Acad., XV, 70 b.

3. In thirteen plays Act I presumably or certainly opens at night; Act II opens at night once, and Act III, some five times. Act I closes at night in eleven plays; Act II, in fourteen, and Act III, in twenty. Six plays, moreover, contain two acts ending at night, and in one (*El pretendiente al revés*), all three acts end at night. In some seven plays Act I opens, and Acts II or III close, at night; three plays contain single acts which both open and close at night, while three others show continuity between Acts II and III.

may be considered to be ambivalent: night may be consciously stressed, as at the ends of acts; or it may be a bit of realistic flux that catches the playwright's eye for a moment, to be related to the carelessness and indeterminate concept of time, mentioned below.

Our data are based on references to night either in the stage directions or in the text proper and take into account such divers items as lights, dressing for night, dinners, plans for the night, *rondantes*,<sup>4</sup> lovers' ladders up walls, and, of course, the hour of night, when it is specified. The references may be to present, past or future night, and often, as in the case of *esta noche*, it is difficult or impossible to ascertain which night is meant, or how long it lasts. If, furthermore, a future night is referred to, the predicted action may take place by day, or even not at all; the reason, of course, is partly Tirso's carelessness, and partly his indeterminate concept of time, against a background of eternal time which, in plays with an explicit religious message, moves to the foreground. When, as often happens, a reference to night occurs in *medias res*—scene VII of any act, for example—are we justified in assuming night to exist both forwards and backwards so long as there is continuity of characters on the stage? Not necessarily, because time is sometimes treated, if not exactly as in process, at least as subject to change, with the approach and passage from day to night and night to dawn more or less clearly indicated.

The fact of night scenes and the mention of night by day or night signifies on an elementary level that verisimilitude is being observed and that certain occurrences take place naturally or conventionally by night, and others by day. The same reasoning applies to dawn, as when, for example, in *Amar por señas*, don Gabriel orders Montoya to awaken him at break of day. The tendency to close all three acts at night is likewise partly a question of elementary verisimilitude, and perhaps more a matter of atmosphere and dramatic effect than an indication of forward motion. More specifically stated, motion for Tirso spurts or lags or whirls about itself; forward motion, real or illusory, is difficult to separate from dramatic effect, or, for that matter, from suspense and curiosity to know the out-

4. Cf. a curious passage in *La Santa Juana*, 1<sup>a</sup> parte (NBAE, IX, 244 b-245 a) addressed by a father to his son:

¿Qué haces aquí, Melchor?  
 ¿No te dejé yo acostado?...  
 ¿Tú de noche? Considero  
 que debes de pretender,  
 siendo hijo de mercader,  
 levantarte a caballero.  
 Que es propio de los señores  
 rondar de noche las damas,  
 aunque peligren sus famas.  
 Mi sangre es de labradores,  
 no de caballeros vengo...



come. When, however, a *dama* drops a glove with the message (torn in two):

*Esta noche o nunca, infante,*<sup>5</sup>

there is at least a definite projection towards future night, towards the *horas más* and

*Esta noche he de gozalla*

of *El burlador de Sevilla*,<sup>6</sup> with overtones of night of death and day of reckoning. The many lovers' adjurations, both in *El burlador* and other plays, for night to come quickly, or never to end if it has already come, are highly effective and either point towards the future or seek to hold it off. The frequent announcement of weddings on future nights may also project the interest forwards, particularly if there are threats or obstacles involved.

The coming of morning may mean little, or, with overtones of retribution for (pleasant) sin, it may mean disillusionment, the end of the night's "confusions," the revelation of identities and relationships, the settling of debts contracted in the night. The bringing in of lights plays a similar rôle to that of dawn, and ranges from a mere "stage prop" of night to the desperate attempt of a Cleandro, in *Quien no cae no se levanta*,<sup>7</sup> to stop any further sinning in his house by a religious illumination which will both light it and burn it down.

The setting for night scenes is as difficult to determine as how long they last, and for similar reasons. Night scenes occur indoors and outdoors, most commonly in the street; in over twenty plays women appear at the window, sometimes more than once in the same play. A considerable number of plays contain gardens, with or without a street, but always surrounded by a more or less symbolical wall. Both gardens and walls are not only challenges and obstacles, but also offer adventures and heighten the mystery to such an extent that sometimes we do not know what degree of love is involved—whether consummation takes place, and where, or even which *dama* or which suitor participates in it. Decorum and gardens do mix on occasion, but let us not forget that it was in the sultry garden of incest that Amón was stricken:

*¿Qué te sucedió que así  
desde que el jardín entraste  
ni duermes, ni estás en ti?*<sup>8</sup>

and that at times gardens seem little more than proving grounds for virility:

5. *La Peña de Francia*, NBAE, IV, 650 ff.

6. *Clás. cast.*, 3<sup>a</sup> ed., III, l. 208 and I, l. 686, respectively.

7. NBAE, IX, 168 a.

8. *La venganza de Tamar*, NBAE, IV, 412 b-413 a.

DON RODRIGO

*¿Hombre hay dentro del jardín?*

CHINCHILLA

*Hombre y tan hombre, que viene  
a mostrar que es para hombre.<sup>9</sup>*

An interesting question is whether there were gratings on the windows that opened on the gardens; the *dama* in *Averigüelo Vargas* invites the lover to visit her

*Por el balcón  
sin reja que al jardín mira  
del parque.<sup>10</sup>*

The elementary verisimilitude mentioned above calls for an overall relationship between the time (day or night) and place, and between them and the type of action. The emphasis, however, is on action and emotional statement rather than on localization in time or space; and we find that many such statements and actions like the kidnapping of women, conspiracies and fighting between individuals and groups, can, and do, occur, by night or day. The one exception is the major theme of love, and although love scenes likewise take place by day or night, night is the mating season par excellence. Love is, to borrow from *El burlador*, the "business" of the night; the real scene is the rendez-vous, the baroque cluster-point where mobile, criss cross intentions, identities, loyalties—of friends and foes—are toyed with, ferreted out and tested, exposed, amalgamated, as the case may be.

In the condominium of night and love, the night is charged with protecting the lovers from fathers, brothers, rivals, from the "stupid rabble," from the police powers of social morality—for the time being; it aids in escape and tends to equalize both social ranks<sup>11</sup> and sexes, thereby enabling women to become the promoters of their own love aspirations—likewise for the time being, while the illusion lasts. In so doing, it provides protective coloration, maneuverability for ends and means and an invitation for the tricks and deceits that constitute the plot and, intellectualized, turn into a game the ardors of the flesh. The night becomes a casuistic psychoanalyst of the baroque *persona* and *personaje*, in whose presence the characters reveal dualities of joys and hopes, and torments, fears and guilt, in words and actions. It cooperates with Fortune to provide "occasions" for love and to implement in the paradoxical freedom of the darkness the "conformities" of the stars:

9. *El castigo del penseque*, BAE, V, 88 c.

10. BAE, V, 681 c.

11. Cf. *El pretendiente al revés* (BAE, V, 29 b):

*Iguales somos a oscuras.*



*Mendo, esta noche,  
sin duda, Mercurio y Venus,  
juntando constelaciones,  
predominan en el cielo,  
pues una influyendo amor,  
y otro eslabonando enredos  
parece que intentan ambos  
sus horas quitarle al sueño.<sup>12</sup>*

For the women, at least, the night of love offers the one and only adventure in a world of decorum, all the more precious and urgent because so fleeting:

*Es porque amor se goza en un instante;  
que tiene la ocasión vuelo ligero.<sup>13</sup>*

Although night scenes are by no means limited to the love rendez-vous, we shall isolate it for analysis because of its predominance. It may take place in the *dama's* room, or, as in *La Santa Juana*, 1<sup>a</sup> parte, be wrongly assumed by the husband in the street to have taken place in his wife's bed; we shall confine our analysis to *damas* at windows and men at their "posts." The *dama* is either at the window or has to be summoned; sometimes there are two windows, and sometimes more than one *dama* appears in quick succession at the same window, to heighten the "confusion." Every lover has a rendez-vous with the night and the simplest form is the lyric soliloquy in which the lover of either sex pours forth his anguish or passion; if both are present they may pool their woes, make recriminations or protestations of love, or repeat with Ramiro in *Avergüelo Vargas*:

*Daré mi mal a entender  
por conocer su afición.<sup>14</sup>*

Literally rhyming *quejas* and *rejas*, the *dama*, alone, may justify her infringement of her honor; she may wrestle with her guilt or doubts or fears, or become a *veladora* of a castle rampart that may well have been already breached:

*Vino la noche, y con el negro raso  
de sus ropas, causó sueño profundo,  
muerte que da a la vida ser segundo,  
sino es a mí que velo y que me abrasso.<sup>15</sup>*

In a simple rendez-vous a young man presents himself according to prearrangement, but things are rarely simple in the *comedia*, and he may arrive too late, or find that the *dama* has changed her mind, or someone else may have invited himself in his place, or was perhaps sent there by

12. *Todo es dar en una cosa*, NBAE, IV, 528 a.

13. *La Peña de Francia*, ed. cit., 653 a.

14. Ed. cit., 682 b.

15. *La villana de la Sagra*, BAE, V, 323 a.

a third person, who may or may not be eavesdropping. Even when the *dama* is alone with the lover their lyrical privacy cannot last long, for the rendez-vous is a vocal light which attracts both rivals and spectators, each on his own mission. The difference between rivals and spectators is almost a matter of degree—whether they raise or lower their voices, utter asides or plunge up to the window, and whether, with the difference narrowing, they express their antagonism in words or clash of swords. They may enter singly or in pairs—*rondantes de dos en dos*—usually two young men or one young man and his servant; they are ordinarily men, but may be women in the double disguise of night and of their own contriving.

The passions involved are almost frighteningly real, but the very same darkness that sharpens this reality simultaneously muffles and disembodies it, makes pantomime and abstraction of it, threatens to push it over the brink of the comic. More specifically, it often seems that the participants in night rendez-vous are indeterminate shapes with feelers:

*Dos bultos me parece que diviso  
enfrente de las rejas. . .*<sup>16</sup>

more important, perhaps, is the fact that the ears become the principal sense:

*De noche mis oídos ojos sean.*<sup>17</sup>

Just as the *damas* tend to shrink to the hand addressed and fondled by the lover, so members of both sexes are represented by, and almost become, voices in the dark; the point should be stressed, because if, as has been stated, the language of the *comedia* is virtually an actor, here we have a superlative example where the language is almost the *comedia* itself. The voices fade in or out according to danger or expediency, and many are the scenes where *disimula la voz* in the stage-direction is part of the disguise or deceit:

DOÑA MAGDALENA

*(Habla con distinta voz, fingiendo que es doña Magdalena que llega. . . Responde con la voz que primero. . . Retírase, y vuelve un momento después, para aparentar que se va la Condesa y se queda doña Magdalena.)*<sup>18</sup>

The "confusion" is worse confounded and is aggravated by a practise of fragmentary overhearing which is really tantamount to underhearing.

The feelers of the shapes are voices, encountering other voices, demanding right of way, and, above all, challenging—demanding, granting, refusing identification—in broad or literal terms. To paraphrase the proverb, when voice meets voice they always challenge; with change of metaphors, the feelers become swords; the characters thrust at sight in a sightless world.

16. *Privar contra su gusto*, BAE, V, 356 b.

17. *Ibid.*

18. *La celosa de sí misma*, BAE, V, 148 a.

Every one—*damas* at windows, men in the street—issues and receives challenges, indeed runs whole gamuts of them, within one or between the two sexes; and, eager as they are to tear off others' masks, they find new ones donned just as fast, and may well be surprised and even disappointed when the ballet of hide-and-seek is over:

## INFANTA

*Conocióme. ¿Hay cosa igual?*"

The defiant, protective, counterchallenge: "*Un hombre (sin nombre),*" "*Un hombre y una mujer,*" of *El burlador* and other plays, merely serves to point up this game of simultaneously having a name and no name—of having reality and no reality, almost, and it is only logical that the servant should be nonplussed:

## DON LUIS

*Calla, necio, no me nombres.*

## CARRASCO

*¿No? Pues perdona, y sepamos  
con qué nombre nos llamamos  
cuando hemos de estar sin nombres.<sup>20</sup>*

The challenge is commonly motivated by love or honor, and partakes of both parleying and bargaining in the free zone of night where women for once are the equals (or superiors) of men. Egos and the rights of egos are challenged, with the contractual implication that such and such conditions on the one side must be met by the other side, as when, in a specific instance, a *dama*, who has been challenged to reveal her identity, refuses to do so unless the lover promises to marry her. The challenge is therefore a probe or test of loyalty and sincerity of intention—of points of human reality, one is tempted to add, amidst the flux of appearances. With expediency and wits outwitting (outchallenging) wits, it is no wonder that many of the characters end by exclaiming not merely "Who is who?" and "Which is she?" but "Who am I?"—"Is it 'dream' or 'frenzy' that I live in?"—"Shall I 'declare myself,' my name, my love, my reality, my real self (*persona*, *ser*), entangled as it is with my split off, projected or feigned self (*personaje*, *parecer*)?"

Not all, of course, is play-acting, mystification and "transformations . . . not to be found in Ovid,"<sup>21</sup> for real people with real feelings are involved in the Pirandellian search for counterparts. Despite all the mechanical and somewhat dehumanizing masking and unmasking, there is without any doubt more suffering and mental anguish than joy amidst the game of

19. *Privar contra su gusto*, ed. cit., 361 c (quoted out of context).

20. *La villana de la Sagra*, ed. cit., 312 c.

21. *Desde Toledo a Madrid*, BAE, V, 487 a.

*burlas* and *veras*. However, the real polarity in this case is not between anguish and joy, but between high seriousness and comedy, with the latter, so to speak, unravelling into slapstick and spookiness. High seriousness and comedy may exist side by side, or take turns in a play, it is true, but it is also true that high seriousness (1) moves towards the comic, without intervention of the latter, when it is overstrained or "taken too seriously," and (2) in other instances is more or less contaminated by the presence or influence of its comic counterpart. It shall be our task, in the remainder of this paper devoted to Tirso, to point out aspects of high seriousness and then to indicate with a few examples how it is drawn towards the opposite pole of slapstick and spookiness. Part of the analysis could, of course, be derived from day scenes alone, but the fact that the tensions and dualities are much sharper at night makes spookiness possible, and, in general, stretches baroque relationships to their breaking point. Logically, one might expect reality of ideals and feelings, when toyed with, to become a toy, but in the baroque things are simultaneously selves and parts of other selves. And there the matter stands: we shall end, as will be seen, by setting up a question mark that recedes from us.

The mood of high seriousness is often that of a lyrical, and more or less symbolical, identification with the night. I have already mentioned the lyric soliloquy of the *veladora* and the duet with the lover; the latter may appear alone—sometimes disguised as a gardener—to conjure the trees, brooks, etc., to witness his suffering, or, less often, his happiness. Night saddens one already sad, and the tendency is simply to lament or to curse the "sad dark night" or to ask for its blessing. The lovers rise to the occasion with a rhetoric of the night in which their imaginations run wild; the night becomes the incidental music of their anguish and the backdrop for their frenzied phantasies.

Frenzy and suffering blend easily with horror and trepidation; the moan or sob or curse becomes a shudder and the night of love that symbolically merged with death can also yield to its reality:

*Simbolizan los horrores  
de esta negra oscuridad  
con la viuda soledad  
de mis difuntos amores;  
vístanse de mis colores,  
pues unos y otros mortales,  
a imitación de mis males,  
igual a una misma suerte,  
las tinieblas y la muerte,  
que a todos nos hace iguales.*<sup>22</sup>

The *colores*, above, are not so far removed from the omens of *Los amantes de Teruel*, with its *caso . . . espantoso* and *noche tenebrosa y fría* anticipating

22. *La firmeza en la hermosura*, NBAE, IX, 354 a.

strikingly the treatment and atmosphere of many nineteenth-century romantic plays.

The lyric agony may rise to horror and trepidation, but the last-named sentiments may also spring into being at any moment, in situations with little or no lyric treatment, in the presence of death or the supernatural:

## MOTA

*¡Válgame Dios! Voces siento  
en la plaza del Alcázar.  
¿Qué puede ser a estas horas?  
Un hielo el pecho me arraiga.<sup>23</sup>*

## DON JUAN

*¡Válgame Dios! todo el cuerpo  
se ha bañado de un sudor,  
y dentro de las entrañas  
se me hiela el corazón.<sup>24</sup>*

However, it must be noted that Mota's situation, when he cries out the quoted words, is grotesque or horribly ironic; he is the butt of a sardonic joke, and were it not for the corpse that is not yet cool we would almost laugh at him as a love-silly ham-actor. It would be unfair to say that both Mota and don Juan "have the shakes," but we are moving in that direction. Don Juan is undoubtedly frightened in his soliloquy scene, but merits a smile for the way in which he brushes off the sparks, "de-spooks himself" and struts away.

In a baroque author like Tirso the much too formalistic, casuistic integration of "the divine" and "the human" into a systematic whole provides an element at least of its own disintegration; and just as many patriotic heroes in the *comedia* stand before us attitudinizing, so much of the rhetoric of love, together with the accompanying action, is constantly teetering on the brim of the ludicrous. This type of the ludicrous is primarily the product of melodramatic tension, but relaxes to a grin in passages like the following:

## INFANTA

*Temblando de verle estoy;  
mas ¿qué mucho que hablar tema  
con hombre del otro mundo,  
sola y de noche?<sup>25</sup>*

She then asks him if he is man or spirit, and he replies that he will reveal his identity at dawn.

The ludicrous merges easily with the comic, breaks into the open, so to speak, when a don Martín, who is far from bellicose in his attitude

23. *El burlador de Sevilla*, ed. cit., II, ll. 571-574.

24. *Ibid.*, III, ll. 664-667.

25. *Privar contra su gusto*, ed. cit., 361 c.

towards dead people and "souls," speaks as follows:

*Si estás gozando de Dios,  
que así lo tengo por cierto,  
o en carrera de salvaros,  
doña Juana, ¿qué buscáis?...*

DON JUAN

*¿Qué es esto? ¿Yo doña Juana?  
¿Yo difunto? ¿Yo alma en pena?*

DOÑA JUANA

*(Ap.) ¡Lindo rato, burla buena!*

CARAMANCHEL

*¿Almitas? ¡Santa Susana!  
¡San Pelagio! ¡Santa Elena!²⁵*

The scene from *Don Gil* is comical and harmless—a friendly joke, as it were, in a play where seriousness is not at its highest tension. The baroque confluence of the two extremes will be the slapstick in the atrium of a religious play like *Quien no cae no se levanta*: Valerio, a gentleman, addresses blandishments to a *dama* whom he assumes to be sitting in a sedan chair:

*Amores, sal de la silla  
y a casa te llevaré.  
Mas ¿qué es esto?*

Cleandro, the father of the *dama*, steps out:

*El desengaño  
que has de ver en mi venganza;  
la burla de tu esperanza,  
de tu atrevimiento el daño.*

When he challenges Valerio to fight, the latter's reply is that of a don Juan Tenorio turned clown:

*No suelen reñir conmigo  
fantasmas que andan de noche.  
¡Jesús, mil veces! No puedo  
creer que Cleandro seas,  
sino el diablo, que deseas  
ponerme de noche miedo.  
Y no será maravilla,  
que, según el mal gobierno  
de mi vida, del infierno*

26. *Don Gil de las calzas verdes*, BAE, V, 419 c.

demonios traigan la silla.  
*¡Jesús, infinitas voces!*  
*¿La Margarita sois vos?*  
*No más amores por Dios.*<sup>27</sup>

At this point the question must be asked: taken together with weak male characters in a number of plays, do *caballeros* treated comically reveal any tendency on the part of Tirso to ridicule them or to disbelieve in them as a social class? With due allowances for healthy fun, my own answer would be in the affirmative, in consonance with a concept of the baroque in Tirso which has thus far been stated in its maximum terms; but since there are scholars who are skeptical even of the word *baroque*, it seems only fair at this point to approach the matter of comic impingement in minimum terms. The question just posed and answered must, therefore, be posed again on a still broader basis: are high seriousness and respect for religion and nobility of rank being undermined by *gracioso*-spookiness and slapstick, or do they stand in juxtaposition without contamination of the higher by the lower? Lest we overstate our case, let us hasten to point out the inherence in the night scene as such of an element of non-comic spookiness or eeriness, because of associations with the night and because the characters seem to be blindfolded and led precariously by their voices. Insofar as religion is concerned, there can be no doubt as to Tirso's fervent orthodoxy or as to the contemporary tolerance of what to a modern may appear to be the jostling of the sacred and the profane. Nevertheless, too much laughter and cleverness, too many spooks *ex machina*, slips of the pen with puns on virgins, perhaps even the grandeur of don Juan (in *El burlador*), if not dangerous, are a danger sign. Within a system of dialectical unity, a flaw or slip in a part is reflected on the whole, even though it be absorbed (or deflected) by laughter or casuistry. It is in this context that we must place Tirso's undoubted disparagement of *caballeros*, recognizing at the same time that they are disparaged both as men and *caballeros*—perhaps even more as men than as *caballeros*—and that Tirso has created others who are in every way worthy of respect. With all these safeguards, the fact, brought into prominence in night scenes, remains that the *caballero* is giving indications of moving in the direction of the *gracioso*.

The servant as counterpart and complement of the master is well known but a far-reaching study has yet to be made of his stylization, frustrations, essentially tragic resignation, dialectical interrelationship with his master and other qualities that make of him a keystone for the understanding of baroque art. In the meantime, suffice it for us to state that in night scenes he would prefer to sleep through the rendez-vous of his master, and sometimes does. Otherwise he quakes or jokes, raises his spooky whisper to a yell when he wishes to disrupt the rendez-vous; or when a Dominga, in *La gallega Mari-Hernández*, jabs him with a pin; or when, in *Quien calla*

27. Ed. cit., 151 a.



*otorga*, after much parrying for identification and some exploration of Brianda's person, lights are brought in and she proves to be a monstrosity. This is of course slapstick and attains its culmination in scenes like the one in *La villana de la Sagra* where don Pedro stoops for a stone to throw, reaches to wipe his hand on a wall, and does so on Carrasco's face. Inspired by fear, the servant's imagination pours forth a sort of rhetoric with spooky connotation; he is no doubt frightened by chains, "giants," knocks at doors, *almas en pena*, and the like, but it is part of his rôle to be frightened and to provide or "invent" an element of spookiness. Part of his susceptibility to spookiness is play-acting or "spoofing," and is as man-made as the groans and noise of chains on the floor above him. Even the fear of the servant has its baroque *persona* and *personaje*, and makes of him, in this and certain other respects, a humble blood-brother of the don Juan of *El burlador*.

For the sake of procedural thoroughness I ran through about 150 plays of Lope de Vega of divers types, keeping statistics for 101 of them. His principal statistical difference from Tirso is the preponderance of night endings for Act II over Act III—a fact, perhaps, that possesses little or no significance, or, perhaps, is a modest demonstration that Act II in Lope is often stronger than Act III, and sometimes even provides a resounding finale for the essential action of the play. There is also continuity of night between acts, but less than in Tirso.

In a rapid reading Lope the playwright eludes our grasp as easily as Lope the man; and, insofar as the relationship between Lope and Tirso is concerned, one ends with the corroboration of the initial assumption that every device in Tirso's night scenes is to be found in Lope. Despite the enormous variety of night events in Lope's plays, what stands out in the reader's memory is not so much the battle scene or any other single type of action as the pastoral setting, modality or generalization, however we choose to designate it. Hence the importance of the lyric garden, where lovers are part bird and part flesh, where Garcilaso's pen and sword are song and sword. Lope is obviously more lyrical than Tirso in the treatment of the garden, within the conceptism practised by both of them.

The difference between the two is revealed at its clearest in the qualitative rôle assigned by them to the window: in Lope it is in use night and day, but by and large does not receive the intensity of focus given to it by Tirso. This is extremely important because what happens before the window in Tirso becomes more charged with *burlas* and *veras* and razzle-dazzle of disguise and identification; there is a strong tendency (in Tirso) towards the mechanical and cleverness for its own sake, and the senses dance with the speed of thought. Moreover, Lope's characters seem to reveal their names much more readily than do Tirso's, despite numerous cases to the contrary; this alone is a small indication of why Tirso is farther along the baroque road than Lope.



The focusing in Tirso's night scenes is, it would seem to me, a definitely baroque phenomenon; it is a quintessence, perhaps *the* quintessence of Tirso, and almost isolates itself for our consideration. Lope's night scenes could, of course, be detached for analysis, but because of the diffuse yet essential oneness of Lope and the present-day preoccupation with the house-dividing-against-itself of the baroque, Tirso is much more alluring. Exploring here Lope's plays only as background for Tirso, I shall, without pursuing the matter farther, merely enumerate four devices or practices which recur in Lope's night scenes: (1) the king as lover, in conflict with one of his subjects; (2) the appearance of figures from beyond the grave in an atmosphere where spookiness is more than offset by primeval terror or religious awe, although not always artistically effective, as Montesinos has shown;<sup>28</sup> (3) bloody avenging justice in Act III of plays like *Los comendadores de Córdoba* and *Peribáñez*; (4) the union of garden and street in a sort of perpetual Saint John's Night where sometimes even the windows seem to come down and join the throng.

E. H. TEMPLIN

*University of California at Los Angeles*

28. *El marqués de las Navas, Teat. ant. esp.*, VI, pp. 167-169.

## LATIN AND ITALIAN GRAMMAR IN THE YEAR 1486

THE FOLLOWING bit of instruction in grammar by Filippo Beroaldo the Elder (1453-1505), the humanist and classical scholar of Bologna, dated on November 22, 1486, soon after his thirty-third birthday, is of interest for the Italian forms which it gives. It is a little surprising to find him offering such elementary instruction, since his name appears on the faculty lists of the University of Bologna from 1472 to 1475 and 1479 to his death in 1505 as holding the chair of rhetoric and poetry.<sup>1</sup> The passage is preserved in Latin MS 3660A of the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, at folios 262v.-264r., and was recorded by a Paolo Landucci (?) de Petrasancta.

Lictetator optime qui pueros doces auscultat. Phy. Beroaldi vaticinatio.

Quum primum didicerit puer per suos casus nomina variare, ut id promptius faciat, iube absque nominibus casuum solos articulos cum vocibus iungere, inde solas absque articulis voces enuntiare. Eadem lex in verborum temporibus numerisque servanda. Nec te lateat Donatum in verbis variandis hoc a vetustis distare grammaticis quod cum ipse bina optativi tempora bis connectat et una enuntiat voce, alii eas voces in singulis temporibus dant optativo quas Donatus soli tribuit subiunctivo. Dicunt enim in presenti optativi, Utinam amem; in imperfecto, Utinam amarem; in perfecto, Utinam amaverim; in plusquamperfecto, Utinam amavissem. In reliquis fere conveniunt omnes. Et ne puer in flagitandis verborum sensibus te obtundat, ad hanc fere imaginem verba reliqua facile interpretabitur. Vale.

Indicativo modo, innelo demonstrativo modo. Tempore presenti, in el tempo presente: Ego amo, Io amo id. Preterito imperfecto, in el tempo cominciato et non fornito: Ego amabam, Io amava. (*folio 263r.*) Preterito perfecto, in el tempo passato: Ego amavi, Io amai et ho amato. Preterito plusquamperfecto, in el tempo piuche passato: Ego amaveram, Io avevo amato. Futuro, in el tempo da venire, Ego amabo, Io amero.

Imperativo modo, in el tempo comandativo modo etc.: Ama tu, ama tu. Futuro: Amato tu, amarai tu.

Optativo modo, in el demonstrativo modo etc.: Utinam amarem, Dio volesse chio amasse et ameria. Preterito perfecto et plusquamperfecto: Utinam amavissem, Dio avesse voluto che io avesse et haveria amato. Futuro: Utinam amem, Dio voglia ch'io ame.

Subiunctivo modo, in el subiunctivo modo etc.: Cum amem, Conciossia ch'io ame. Preterito imperfecto: Cum amarem, Conciosfosse ch'io amasse. Preterito perfecto: Cum amaverim, Conciossia che io habia amato. Preterito plusquamperfecto: Cum amavissem, Conciosfusse stato che io avesse amato. Futuro: Cum amavero, Concio sara che Io amero overo haverio amato.

Infinitivo modo, innelo infinitivo modo etc.: Amare, amare; amavisse, havar' (haver?) amato; amatum ire vel amaturus esse, havere damare o essere damare.

1. U. Dallari, *I Rotuli dei lettori legisti e artisti dello Studio bolognese dal 1384 al 1799*, 1888-1924, I, 90, 93, etc. to 188.

Gerundiva: Amandi, per amare o de amare; Amando, amando o essendo amato; Amandum, ad amare et essere amato. Amatum, vado ad amare; amatu dignum, degno (*folio 263v.*) de essere amato. Amans, Lo amante overo quello ch'ama; amaturus, da amare overo quello ch'amera.

Indicativo modo ignoscente: Ego amor, Io so amato; Amabar, Io era amato; Amatus sum vel fui, Io so o fui amato; Amatus eram vel fueram, Io era overo era stato amato; Amabor, Io saro amato.

Imperativo ignoscente: Amare tu, sia amato tu; Amator tu, sarai amato tu.

Optativo modo ignoscente: Utinam amarer, Dio volesse ch' io fusse o foria amato; Amatus essem vel fuissem, Io fosse o fosse stato amato; Amer, sia amato.

Subiunctivo ignoscente: Amer, sia amato; Amarem, fossi amato; Amatus sim vel fuissem, Io sia o sia stato amato; Amatus essem vel fuissem, Io fussi o fussi stato amato; Amatus ero vel fuero, Io saro o saro stato amato.

Infinitivo ignoscente: Amari, essere amato; Amatum esse vel fuisse, essere stato amato; Amatum iri, da essere amato.

Amatus, lo amato overo quello ch' e amato.

Amandus, da essere amato overo quello ch' sara amato.

In sensu verbi. Gaudeo semper ante singulas personas preponantur talia: Io, me; tu, te; quello, le; noi, ne; voi, ve; quelli, se. Gerundia neutrorum adverte ne male interpretaris sic et verbum memini.

Vulgares articuli casuum singularium sunt Lo vel (*folio 264r.*) la, De ad Lo o Da; pluralium, Del ad li o Da. Propria nomina vulgaribus articulis non indigent sicut pronomina primitiva ne latinis quidem.

Ex opinione Philippi Beroaldi in civitate (?) Bononiensi primario comoranti (?) mihi Paulo de Landucis (?) de Petrasancta ascribi fiat (?) sub eius audientia xxii Novenbris 1486.

Idem Paulus etc.

LYNN THORNDIKE  
*Columbia University*

---

---

## REVIEWS

---

---

*Le Roman de Barlaam et Josaphat: recherches sur la tradition manuscrite latine et française.* Par Jean Sonet, S. J. Louvain, Bibliothèque de l'Université, 1949. Pp. 315.

If the number of variant versions of a legend and the number of manuscripts extant today are an index of the widespread popularity and influence of a medieval text, then surely the story of *Barlaam et Josaphat* deserves more attention than it usually receives today. Where overwrought moderns rush to buy best sellers to help them attain Peace of Mind or Peace of Soul, medieval man apparently sought rather for inspiration of soul in works such as the *Barlaam*. Then, as now, the most popular books were not necessarily the finest or the best written, but those which best supplied the spiritual needs of the time. The reasons for the favor enjoyed by the legend of Barlaam and Josaphat are not hard to find. The legend, which is obviously a Christian reworking of the life of Gautama the Buddha, is a very striking and beautiful one, full of the simple and compelling enthusiasm of the earlier saints' legends.

Building on the work of his predecessors, in particular on that of P. Peeters, "La Première Traduction latine de Barlaam et Josaphat et son original grec," *Analecta Bollandiana*, XLIX, 276-312, in regard to the transmission of the legend from the Orient to Latin Christendom in the mid-eleventh century via a Greek version, and on that of E. C. Armstrong's *The French Metrical Versions of Barlaam and Josaphat*, in regard to the French versions, Father Sonet has given us for the first time a general study of the legend, the parables and their transmission. He has made a thorough, and so far as possible, first-hand survey and classification of the Latin as well as of the Romance versions, and has listed the manuscripts of both with painstaking care and completeness. In this respect it is to be regretted that, like so many continental scholars, he failed to consult De Ricci and Wilson's *Census of manuscripts in this country*; he would have found two more Latin items to add to his list.

Father Sonet distinguishes ten distinct French versions which date from the early thirteenth through the fifteenth century. Of the three verse redactions, that of Chardry (early thirteenth century), that of Gui de Cambrai (between 1209 and 1220) and the "anonymous" version, only the latter is unpublished, and accordingly it receives the author's closest and most detailed study. He announces (page 176) a critical edition of this text which will certainly be most welcome; meanwhile in the present volume he gives us a transcription of the extensive fragments of the Besançon MS 552 (1032 lines) and of the 143 lines of the text which are found in the fragments in the library of the Cividale del Friuli MS Busta 24. A critical ap-

paratus at the foot of the pages gives the variant readings of the complete manuscripts of Tours 949 and Carpentras 473 (L 465). These variants apparently list all deviations from his transcribed text, including those which are purely orthographical. The presentation of the variants is somewhat confusing, since the editor places the identifying sigla C and T immediately before the variant and in the same upper case type. The more conventional placing of such sigla after the variant and in a different font (bold-face or italic) would certainly make for more clarity.

In the absence of the manuscripts it is of course impossible to control the accuracy of the transcription, but the meticulous care and scholarly method exhibited throughout the book inspire full confidence. Some of the spots where the text seems questionable may be marred by simple typographical errors, of which, unfortunately, there are quite a number. One wonders, for example, whether there should be a final *t* in the second *saint* in line 110: *E saint en ame e saint en cors*, whether the editor or the typesetter (or, on occasion, the scribe) is responsible for the omission of the cedilla in line 500, the insertion of the intrusive comma in the middle of line 625, the omission of the final *s* on *tu requier* (line 651, : *amis chiers*), the placing of a period after line 122 of the Cividale fragment, etc. A very few slips are apparently due to the editor himself: the omission of the accent on *ades* (line 280 and Cividale line 142), *pales* (< *palatium*) (489) and *remes* (497). On the other hand, there is an unwanted accent on *delivrés* (646). One wonders, also, why the editor writes *auroit* (671) and *aurai* (902), instead of *avroit* and *avrai*, according to the usual custom of modern editors. In special times and places there is a good deal to be said for transcriptions with *u* in such cases, but there are no apparent indications for this in the present instance.

Despite the author's assertion, the glossary is not complete: the word *ades* referred to above is lacking, for example. In the "Table des noms propres" the word *Dieu* in line 102 is listed as an object case singular, although the context shows it to be a subject case plural: *E dient bien tuit e otroient / Ne sont pas Dieu cil que il croient*.

These are all, of course, very insignificant points indeed in comparison with the entirely sound conception, execution, and presentation of this very valuable study of the legend and these prolegomena to the forthcoming critical edition of the anonymous version of the legend which we are promised.

JEAN MISRAHI

Fordham University

*Guido Cavalcanti's Theory of Love. The Canzone d'Amore and Other Related Problems.* By J. E. Shaw. Toronto, University of Toronto Press, 1949. Pp. ix + 228.

The longest of the three essays in this excellent book of Professor Shaw is dedicated to the celebrated *canzone*, *Donna mi prega*, of Guido Caval-

canti. Professor Shaw offers us his version of the text, based on that of Casella, but with some emendations in his own hand, notably in the matter of punctuation. The version is then defended and the poem painstakingly analyzed in the longest chapter of the book (pages 9-96), after which comes a translation, literal and coherent though apologetically presented. Two shorter essays, "Guinizelli, Cavalcanti, Dante" and "The Dolce Stil Nuovo" follow; their substance is of course closely related to the discussion of Cavalcanti's *canzone*, and the book, though consisting of three independent essays, has nonetheless a true unity of matter.

De Sanctis has remarked that the *canzone* of Cavalcanti was studied by his contemporaries "in the spirit that one would bring to a philosophical treatise" and not without reason, for a philosophical treatise it is, at times so crammed with abstruse and elliptic dialectic that, were it not for the verse form, the reader would scarcely suspect it of being poetry. Its very obscurity has inevitably endowed it with fascination for critics throughout the centuries and if for no other reason it may well be studied as an example of what Dante might have written—in manner if not in matter—had not the "fren dell' arte" somewhat held in check his own passionate interest in psychological analysis and his fondness for the technique of the Schoolmen. Professor Shaw's critical bibliography, which forms an appendix to his book, testifies to the lasting interest the poem has aroused, and also provides the student with opportunity to check the version and interpretation here set forth against the work of other scholars. This is an honest and admirable procedure on the part of Professor Shaw. One would, however, have to have spent as much time and energy on the study of the poem as the editor himself in order to be justified in either defending or attacking his interpretation of the many controversial passages. I confess I lack the presumption for such an enterprise, but some general observations may be made to indicate the character of Professor Shaw's treatment.

It should be remarked at once that although the text as here offered is based on Casella's, the commentary is quite another matter. In the above mentioned Appendix, Professor Shaw courteously and regretfully finds himself obliged to note a certain mystical vagueness in Casella's interpretation, and I think most of us who are familiar with it would be inclined to agree. This fault surely cannot be attributed to Professor Shaw himself, for every term is defined with precision even at the risk of overelaboration and perhaps in one or two cases of arbitrariness. For the most part, in analyzing the terms and the Scholastic phraseology, the editor relies heavily on Albertus Magnus, following the lead of Salvadori, who made of the great Doctor the principal source of the poet's Scholastic equipment. Inasmuch as appeals to this authority make sense, at least in the persuasive hands of the commentator, such an approach would seem to be justified. The temptation of expounding Albertus himself rather than the poem must have been ever present but, in the main, it has been successfully



resisted. Taken as a whole the commentary is well organized and convincing and, if here and there the analysis of the poet's meaning seems somewhat arbitrary, it is certainly no more true for Professor Shaw than for the other commentators of the poem. It does not make for easy reading; the commentary no less than the poem is written for "persone ch'hanno intendimento," but it is as clear and as concise as the substance permits. The analysis of each stanza is concluded by a succinct and useful summary, for Professor Shaw, a distinguished teacher no less than a scholar, is aware of the value of judicious repetition. The final paragraphs of the essay, containing an appreciation of the work, I find very appealing. I think the comparison of Cavalcanti to Macchiavelli, who also brought to the discussion of problems close to his heart a certain fierce objectivity, is one worth making. However, moved as I am by Professor Shaw's warm defense of the poem, I note that even while insisting that it is something more than versified prose he does not explicitly claim that it is poetry—indeed in a later essay he concedes that to most moderns it "is not poetry at all." And one cannot help thinking, as he lays aside these verses, how much more beautifully Leopardi portrayed what seems to be the basic core of Cavalcanti's thought. In fairness, however, to Cavalcanti, we should not overlook another point made by Professor Shaw: the reader, thinking in terms of the *dolce stil nuovo* and of Dante is not prepared for the unconventional point of view expressed in the *canzone*. Romanticism, to say nothing of Renaissance Neo-Platonism, have prepared us all too well for Leopardi's lines.

The second essay, "Guinizelli, Cavalcanti, Dante," is an analysis of the attitudes toward love revealed by the poets in question. Though the treatment is here not strikingly original and, in the case of Cavalcanti, inevitably somewhat repetitious, the reader may again be grateful for the clarity with which Professor Shaw sets forth his interpretations. I like particularly the point made in the opening paragraph. It is not in literary sources alone, we are told, nor perhaps even primarily there that we should look for the inspiration of the medieval lyric. In the author's own words, which seem worthy of direct quotation:

It is not because of anything he has read or has been taught that an adolescent falls in love, sometimes with a commonplace girl who is unattractive to others, often with a mature woman, so that for him she is a perfect creature in whose presence he feels humble and good, revolting with disgust against any carnal thought with regard to her. . . . It seems to me that this natural potentiality is too little considered by scholars in their search for the causes of the ideal quality of love in the poetry of the troubadours. Had it not been for that natural potentiality the notions which informed their love poetry, no matter whence derived, would never have become sufficiently appealing for them to do so.<sup>1</sup>

As baffling as the interpretation of Cavalcanti's *canzone* and of wider interest to the world of Italian scholars is the age old problem of what

1. Pp. 103-104.

Dante meant by his phrase *dolce stil nuovo*, particularly when taken with its context in *Purgatorio*, xxiv, 49-63. The enigma is not simple but has many facets, of which two have especially engaged the attention of the critics: what precisely does the phrase signify? and what poets may be assumed to be indicated, in the phrase "le vostre penne" (line 58), as belonging to the same school or group as Dante? Professor Shaw scrutinizes with his customary patience and courtesy the various and varying opinions of Figurelli, Rossi, Vossler and others and finds none entirely satisfying. As for the members of the group Professor Shaw states:

There is . . . a general resemblance which justifies the historian in classifying together all the poets who have so often been called "of the *dolce stil nuovo*." This resemblance is in form rather than in ideas. It is the result of influence and imitation: Cavalcanti and Guinizelli influence Dante; Cavalcanti at times imitates Guinizelli; Cino frequently imitates all three, and so do Lapo, Gianni, Alfani and Frescobaldi.<sup>2</sup>

On the significance of the phrase itself his conclusion is stated in a succinct paragraph, in the course of his remarks on Figurelli's theory:

Of these two characteristics which Figurelli calls the "elemento mistico e l'elemento razionale," it is the second that is more conspicuous in the love poetry of Cavalcanti and Cino as well as in that of Dante. I should prefer to call it the *studious and cultivated treatment of love*. This I think is the novelty that Dante had in mind.<sup>3</sup>

The only thing that seems inadequate in this statement which, as indicated, follows Figurelli with a slight shift of emphasis, is that it seems to overlook the requirement of spontaneity which is implicit in the lines "I' mi son un che quando/Amor mi spira, noto, e a quel modo/che ditta dentro vo significando." Professor Shaw is not unaware of this shortcoming and affirms that Dante did in fact appreciate inspiration, but it is again a question of emphasis; perhaps in reaction to Rossi's theory, which Professor Shaw finds, not without reason, "more modern than medieval," the element of inspiration has been, I think, minimized in his exposition. Francesco Flora's chapter on this topic (in his *Storia della letteratura italiana*, I, 66-70) is not cited—it may be that the essay was in press before the book was available or it may be because Flora's comments are brief and in one sense superficial—yet it does have a fresh approach, and with the opinion that the "parole vaghe di Dante . . . erano un sentimento, non una dottrina,"<sup>4</sup> Professor Shaw, if I understand him correctly, would not be entirely out of sympathy. I do not know whether he would accept Flora's statement that Dante's circle was a group of young poets filled with a new doctrine and in their enthusiasm inclined to think that they had hit upon a secret of true poetry unknown to their predecessors—"Dante

2. P. 136.

3. P. 137. Italics are Professor Shaw's.

4. P. 67.

aveva torto," says Flora, "ma come poteva egli—giovane— non sentirsi diverso da Guittone?"<sup>5</sup>—but his reference to Sapegno's article would indicate that he would see much truth in Flora's further observation: "E possibile adunare i caratteri che distinguono il dolce stil nuovo dalla poesia precedente soltanto in quel che della nuova opera non è poesia. . . ."<sup>6</sup> Which is not to say of course that the other "caratteri" are not important.

In conclusion I think it may be said that anyone even superficially acquainted with Dante and his times will read this book with admiration for the author's mastery of the field and for the integrity of his scholarship. And the more the reader knows of that field, the deeper his admiration will be. If, as is also likely, Dante scholars find in these pages points that seem debatable, arguments not entirely convincing, and details that may seem to need greater or less emphasis, that will be only another proof that the book is an important one, concerned with matters of vital interest to the profession. It is a valuable work and Professor Shaw is to be congratulated. Congratulations should also go to the Department of Romance Languages and the Press of Toronto University for inaugurating their new Romance Series with this happy choice. The book is handsomely made and worthy of its contents.

THOMAS G. BERGIN

*Yale University*

*The Universe of Pontus de Tyard. A Critical Edition of L'Univers. With Introduction and Notes by John C. Lapp. Ithaca, New York, Cornell University Press, 1950. Pp. lxii + 201.*

This book is a labor of love and a fine culmination of the editor's rewarding research on Tyard's philosophical works. Finding *L'Univers* too little known and virtually unavailable, Professor Lapp now makes it available in a handsome edition that deserves to make it better known. Tyard's poems had fared better; the Marty-Laveaux edition has long since made them accessible, and their place in the histories of literature is modest but apparently secure. They may even benefit in time by the recent surge of interest in Pontus' hermetic and metaphysical contemporaries; for they are a real link between the work of his friend Scève and that of his colleagues in the Pléiade. It is as a poet that Tyard will probably still attract most readers, and rightly so; but Tyard the natural philosopher deserves to be remembered in his own right.

One of the earliest philosophical works ever written in French, *L'Univers, ou discours des parties et de la nature du monde* first appeared in 1557. In a second edition (1578), Pontus made many additions and divided the dialogue into two parts, *Le Premier Curieux* and *Le Second Curieux*. His *Discours philosophiques* of 1587 include a further enlarged third edition, the last to appear in his lifetime and until now. The persons of the dia-

5. P. 70.

6. P. 70.

logues are three: Pontus himself, the theologian Hieromnime, and Le Curieux, whom Professor Lapp identifies as Tyard's cousin, the poet and polymath Guillaume des Autels.

The subject is indeed the universe, the anthropocentric universe of Tyard's time. The longer *Premier Curieux* treats of the external world: the spheres, stars and planets, sun and moon, and their numbers, sizes, distances, nature and origin; the four elements of earth, water, fire and air, and their myriad phenomena such as comets, rainbows, weather, tides, earthquakes, continents old and new, and geological changes in general; finally the goodness of the earth, where Nature by God's Providence creates life and death out of a harmony of opposites. The shorter *Second Curieux . . . traitant des choses intellectuelles* deals briefly with the soul, less briefly with man as the microcosm who through his intelligence participates in all things, and mainly with God—views of the ancients, proofs of his existence and arguments against it—and the creation and possible final destruction of the world. A long speech by Hieromnime on the dangers of rash speculation in these matters leads the three friends to an almost fideistic conclusion.

*L'Univers* is interesting as a product of its time and in two particular ways. First, it is the universe of the learned Pontus de Tyard, poet, theologian, astronomer and natural scientist eager in the search for truth. Second, it is a courteous confrontation of the conservative theological attitude of Hieromnime and the respectful but open inquiry of Pontus and Le Curieux. Though Le Curieux is perhaps bolder and more outspoken than the eminently tactful author and host, still their viewpoints are so close that at one point at least (page 144) Pontus in his second edition transfers a speech from Le Curieux to himself. Both dialogues are a mixture, somewhat reminiscent of Bodin, of sound good sense with what today seems amazing credulity—a credulity which appears to spring mainly from an invincible optimism about man's powers and a brave, sometimes rash determination to make man's universe tidy and fully explained. Thus Tyard accepts or at least seriously considers all kinds of ambitious speculations of the ancients: on the comparative roundness of the elements, the numbering of the spheres, the measurement of celestial distances according to the room that there must be, the analogies between sun and planets and God and man, the passionlessness of the sun and moon, the solidity of the sky, the reason why stars twinkle and planets do not, the music of the spheres, the way the moon starts fires, manna as a form of precipitation, the magical effects of lightning, the abysses in the sea which engulf ships without warning, and all the analogies that show man as the microcosm. Whenever he has the tools, however, Tyard shows a sturdy experimental good sense in testing truth: witness his critique of Ptolemy on divination, his roasting a luckless salamander to test its immunity to fire, and his stanch support—almost unique in his time, as his present editor has shown—of the Copernican theory.

The interest of the mixture, however, is mainly documentary. Just once Professor Lapp seems to forget this, when near the end of his Introduction he states that Pontus "deserves a place in the history of French thought not inferior to that of a Bodin, a Pasquier, a Le Roy, an Estienne—even a Montaigne." The last comparison is dangerous. For after all, Montaigne still has much to teach us all, whereas Pontus has not. Montaigne recognized man's limitations, consented "not to know what we do not know," sensed in all the natural sciences what he clearly saw in medicine, that for solid research the foundations and tools were still lacking; and taking himself as his own physics and metaphysics, he made his tremendous and still living contribution to our knowledge of ourselves and of others. It is true of course that in science zealous prophets were needed; but it still seems clear that Montaigne, for all his paradoxes and exaggerations, had a far clearer concept than Tyard of what a man of their time could and could not accomplish.

Everywhere else Professor Lapp's claims for his author are admirably measured and judicious. In his clear and readable Introduction, which is the best thing of its kind on Pontus, he admits (page xi) that Tyard was "not a major figure of his time . . . neither a great poet nor a great philosopher," and soundly assesses his style in general (page xxxvii) as "adequate to his purpose: the presentation of philosophical ideas in accessible and readable form." Indeed Tyard's prose style is rarely more and rarely less; there is little to blame, but also little that is striking. The best of it has gone into Professor Lapp's Introduction to illustrate his points; and the incisive clarity of the Introduction is not always shared by the work itself. The dramatic possibilities of the dialogue form are too little exploited: the author and Le Curieux are too much alike, and speeches of nineteen pages (149-168) do not make for lively reading. For any one but a historian of science, much of *L'Univers* has aged fast. The work remains generally interesting, rarely absorbing.

Professor Lapp's editing is scholarly and refreshingly unobtrusive. The indications of variants are simple and clear, and the notes for 192 pages of text take up only six pages at the end. Sometimes, to be sure, more help would be welcome.<sup>1</sup> But it is a real pleasure to read a scholarly edition<sup>2</sup> of a work of this period in which the text has a chance to breathe, and the author to speak for himself.

1. Since not all works cited appear in the Bibliography, the forgetful reader must look back from page xxix to page xvi to find what is Aynard's *op. cit.*, and from xviii to xii for the full title of Des Autels's *A. R.* Unfamiliar but unexplained are Agapet (p. xxv), Arpalissa, Thelessilida and Cloelia (xxxix), and the Chalazophylaces (83). One would like to know not only who Dyoscorides was, but what was his "advise" (64), and just why Pliny was "trop curieux" (84). And the beginning (apparently on page 121) of the long addition which ends early in the second discourse (133) might have been marked more clearly by a note.

2. Some apparent slips, but not many, have been noted: "pouvoir" for "pouvoir" (p. 1); "ä" for "ä" (2); "epithere" for "epithete" (32); "peu" for "feu" (69); "en-

Pontus de Tyard deserves this courtesy. His learning, his optimism, his good sense, his own unwavering courtesy and *honnêteté* are qualities that make him an attractive person as well as a notable polymath and poet. Thanks to Professor Lapp, we now can know his universe. It is worth knowing, and it could hardly have been better or more attractively presented.

DONALD M. FRAME

*Columbia University*

*The Counter-Renaissance.* By Hiram Haydn. New York, Scribner's, 1950. Pp. xx + 705.

The subject of this important and attractive volume is the complex of ideas that arose mostly in the sixteenth century to challenge the prevalent confident Thomistic vision of the world and man's place in it. "The central premise," Mr. Haydn writes (pages xiii-xiv), "of the great synthesis which Thomas Aquinas bequeathed to the later Christian humanists is summarized in Cicero's statement that 'True law is right reason in agreement with nature; it is of universal application, unchanging and eternal.' . . . Luther and Calvin in theology, Machiavelli in political theory, Montaigne in his ethical and psychological studies . . . were all attacking this one central principle. . . ." It is this attack that he calls the Counter-Renaissance. Only in terms of it, he finds, can the tensions, conflicts, and inconsistencies of many of the great Elizabethans be satisfactorily explained.

The merits of the book are great. The treatment of Elizabethan literature, Mr. Haydn's field of especial competence, seems really excellent and is certainly convincing and richly suggestive. In other fields the unusual juxtapositions are always stimulating and often very illuminating. We are familiar with the differences between Luther, Calvin, Machiavelli and Montaigne; we are often hard pressed to explain, and tempted to scamp, certain of their striking affinities. Of these and other important currents of ideas in Renaissance Italy, France, and England Mr. Haydn gives a lucid and persuasive survey, while offering in the process further proof that literary scholarship can be philosophical, readable and literary.

With the merits there are also weaknesses. In contrasting his Counter-Renaissance with the generally earlier classical revival, Mr. Haydn so stresses the orthodoxy of the latter as almost to abandon the notion of a Renaissance. But if there was no Renaissance, how can there be a Counter-Renaissance? And if the Counter-Renaissance is the real Renaissance, let us call it that. Also his thesis makes him lodge some writers badly: some

ramer" for "entamer" (88), "rare faction" for "rarefaction" (92); a repetition of "aisément on le doit croire muable, est par mille" (101); "μετεμύχως" for "μετεμύχως" (132); "épaissement" for "épaissement" or "épaissement" (141); "cro-yient" for "croyoient" (151); "exhations" for "exhalations" (183); "digeance" for "diligence" (185); Montaigne's "Apologie de Raimond Sebond" listed as III, xi instead of II, xii (197, n. 68); "agumens" for "argumens" (198, n. 18).



on Procrustean beds, others with bedfellows who are not only strange but highly uncongenial.

Mr. Haydn is well aware, as his first chapter shows, that there are important differences between medieval orthodoxy and Renaissance Christian humanism. He protests against "this new insistence upon whitewashing the Elizabethans" and "the recent fashionable tendency to debunk the Renaissance and to exalt the Middle Ages" (pages 2, 4). But to this reviewer he seems too much swayed by the views of three able and eminent minimizers of the originality of Renaissance Christian humanism: his two main authorities on this field, Professors John H. Randall, Jr. (*The Making of the Modern Mind*) and Etienne Gilson (*The Spirit of Medieval Philosophy*), and his main opponent on the Elizabethans, Professor Douglas Bush (*The Renaissance and English Humanism*). He puts up only a delaying fight against these and other authorities. His Counter-Renaissance retains its color, but Christian humanism remains pretty "whitewashed."

As he says, the whole field is a battleground. Michelet and Burckhardt are pretty well battered now, but the battle is far from over. All these sweeping views depend on who looks how at what. The critic who is primarily a philosopher, natural or social scientist or theologian will probably always find Renaissance Christian humanism rather unimportant and unoriginal, as offering no strikingly new view of the nature of God or the universe. The classicist, aesthete or moralist is likely to find the return to the real classics and the concern with man in his own terms renovating and vital. To the student whose main interest is in French literature—like the present reviewer—the break with medieval Scholasticism will seem sharper and more crucial than to one whose particular field is English or Italian. To be sure, it is a chapter on "Continental Humanism" that Professor Bush concludes by saying that "the Classical humanism of the Renaissance was fundamentally medieval and fundamentally Christian"; but in the whole chapter he mentions only one Frenchman—Budé—and only as the recipient of a letter from Erasmus. As he says earlier, contemporary scholarship tends either to absorb the Renaissance in the Middle Ages or the Middle Ages in the Renaissance, and there is great danger in abolishing either period.

Mr. Haydn's dependence on the "medievalists" shows at one critical point when he uses the term *humanism* to mean merely the recognition of value in man and his life on earth (pages 34–35). There is ample precedent for such a loose use of the term today, when almost every conceivable attitude or view claims to be humanism. But as applied to the Renaissance, the word has an accepted and recognized meaning: something like exuberant enthusiasm for classical antiquity and secular concern with man and his conduct. This is its usual meaning in Mr. Haydn's book. Yet in stressing the similarity between medieval and Renaissance humanism he gives it this loose meaning of a sort of vague minimal optimism about man. This blurs the difference but does not affect or refute it.

In concluding his first chapter Mr. Haydn states that "that great structure of unified, ordered and symmetrical thought built under the direction of Thomas Aquinas" is "renovated by the Renaissance Christian humanists" (page 67). This may be true of Ficino and Pico, but it is not true of France. Here the split is clear, and no theory that tries to obliterate it will explain the early sixteenth century. It was the pious Christian humanist Budé who persuaded the most Christian king to found a trilingual academy, the *Lecteurs Royaux*, free from the domination of the conservative theologians; it was pious Christian humanists who applauded its founding, and the conservative Sorbonne who bitterly opposed it. Almost without exception, the leading writers and thinkers—Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, Budé, Marguerite de Navarre, Marot and Rabelais, as well as the cosmopolitan Erasmus—saw mainly ignorance and futility in medieval theology and sought the Bible and the ancients beyond their commentators. They were little concerned with Aquinas; they hardly knew him. If they acquiesced in his world-view, it was passively; if they did not challenge it, that probably was mainly because they first had other things to do and a lot to learn. And the metaphysical challenge was not long in coming: it was only twenty years from the founding of the *Lecteurs Royaux* to Pierre Ramus's attack on Aristotle, which the Sorbonne was quick to see as a challenge to the Scholastic system. In Mr. Haydn's terms, this makes Ramus a man of the Counter-Renaissance. But here as often elsewhere his "Counter-Renaissance" figures seem much less counter-Renaissance than counter-medieval and pro-Renaissance.

The dangers of ignoring the split in early sixteenth-century French thought are apparent in detail. Nothing at all is said of the humanist-evangelist alliance that is the most striking phenomenon of the years before the Placards and Calvin; nothing of Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples, nothing of Marot. Marguerite de Navarre becomes a Calvinist (pages 355-358). Erasmus has to be placed on the conservative side (page 17), but he keeps popping up, as well he might, on the other (pages 96, 394, 411, 452). Rabelais, who called Erasmus his spiritual father and mother, is so to speak orphaned on the side of the Counter-Renaissance.

"One could relate in detail," writes Mr. Haydn on page 21, "how Rabelais in a hundred ways satirized the concept of universal and established laws of God and nature and the absolutism of the ideal." If one could, one should. Mr. Haydn's Rabelais is too much the Rabelais of legend. His apparently sincere Erasman piety is ignored, as well as his particular fondness for evangelism. A satirical intent is found (pages 395, 421) in passages that seem wholly innocent of satire. He is said to oppose reason in the interests of nature and to deny that reason has validity or force (pages 67, 84, 421, 487-489). But in his own terms at least he does nothing of the sort. Whatever he means by reason, he is for it;<sup>1</sup> some of his highest praise

1. See Leonard Wang, "Rabelais on Reason," *Bard Review*, II (May, 1948), 178-186.

for his beloved Pantagruel is for inhabiting the "déficque manoir de raison" (III, ii); he blasts the Sorbonne for lacking it when Janotus de Bragmardo tells his colleagues scathingly (I, xx): "Raison (dist Janotus), nous n'en usons point céans." Rabelais is not a real believer in progress merely because he does not believe in the decay of nature.<sup>2</sup> Nor is it at all clear that he holds an aristocratic concept of honor (pages 572-573). The "bien néz" of the famous passage that follows and explains the "Fay ce que voudras" may not be blue-bloods, especially since one of the three groups admitted to Thélème is the evangelist preachers. And translator is traitor when on page 587 Mr. Haydn bases a similar social conclusion on Frère Jean's remark (V, xv): "Come, he that would be thought a gentleman, let him storm a town; well, then, shall we go?" For most of this is Le Motteux; all Rabelais wrote was "Or ça, irons-nous?" To be sure, Rabelais is still enigmatic and will probably always be; but the solid body of facts and insights offered by such scholars as Villey, Plattard and above all Professor Lucien Febvre should be used by anyone writing on him today. Actually he fits even less well than Erasmus into either of Mr. Haydn's Renaissance groups.

These are minor figures in Mr. Haydn's cast; Montaigne is one of his stars. He has a real feeling for him; his quotations are admirably chosen; and specialized Montaigne scholarship could well use and ponder many of his insights. Montaigne speaks and is discussed on the vanity of learning and the repeal of universal law; as a member of the "hand-in-the-wound" school of stubborn reliance on experience alone, a naturalistic denier of limit, and an admirer of nature above art. All this is good, and much of it is excellent. But all too often, and to no purpose, Montaigne is oversimplified and truncated; his complex balance and his most constructive thought is ignored. He is shown as accepting nothing but experience, denying force and validity to reason, and holding that "knowledge is impossible for man" (pages 84, 90, 216). Actually his balance of experience and reason, not to mention judgment and *entendement*, is far more Baconian than Mr. Haydn shows: witness the beginning of "De l'expérience" and the telling statement in the "Apologie de Raimond Sebond" that one opinion is as good as another *unless reason makes the difference*; and his only denial of the possibility of knowledge is that of perfect knowledge to man without divine grace. Mr. Haydn's contrast of medieval universality with Montaigne's particular and individual study of man (pages 142-148, 384, 387; but contrast 489) is far too sweeping. Only before 1580 is it true that "Montaigne deserts and denies the efficacy of the study of universal man"; afterwards, though he does study man through himself, he knows that moral philosophy is possible, since "chaque homme porte la forme entiere de l'humaine condition." Montaigne is linked with Machiavelli as denying all validity or at least all relevance to the ideal in the

2. P. 531. See Professor A. C. Keller's forthcoming article in *PMLA* on "The Idea of Progress in Rabelais."

interests of the real and placing the good of the state above private moral virtues (pages 228-236, 251, 258, 423, 452-453). But on just these points Montaigne is a vehement critic of Machiavelli, and he writes one whole chapter to prove it (III, i: "De l'utile et de l'honneste"). And when Mr. Haydn says that Montaigne sees no positive relation between happiness and virtue (page 403) and places him among the pessimists about man (pages 429-430), he is ignoring his most mature thought.<sup>3</sup>

Mr. Haydn's thesis would not be weakened a bit if he had acknowledged more often that Montaigne cannot be confined within the limits of his Counter-Renaissance. Far more alarming are such general definitions of the Counter-Renaissance group as this one: "What unites these otherwise dissimilar thinkers of the sixteenth century is that they share completely an anti-intellectualistic, anti-moralistic, anti-synthetic, anti-authoritarian bias" (page xiii). This means that Calvin is anti-intellectualistic, anti-synthetic, and anti-authoritarian; it means that Montaigne is anti-moralistic. And this simply is not so.

Mr. Haydn's thesis is far stronger than such sweeping statements suggest. His book contains some misunderstanding and some systematizing distortion; which is a pity, for none of it is vital to his case. What he has achieved is substantial and valuable: to show how many of the great Renaissance thinkers—Machiavelli, Luther, Calvin, Montaigne, Bacon, Donne, and Shakespeare among others—either broke sharply with the generally optimistic Christian humanism of men like More and Erasmus, or at least were aware of such a break, were more or less tormented by it, and reflected it in their works. All the major themes that he groups under his title are very important, both in themselves and in their interrelations: the vanity of learning, fideism, the repeal of universal law, the empirical science of the particular, the denial of limit for romantic or naturalistic reasons, the preference for "nature" over "art," the changes wrought in the courtly tradition of love and honor. Mr. Haydn's treatment of his impressive documentation is masterful, always lucid, often eloquent, especially in his splendid concluding chapter where he studies Counter-Renaissance themes and conflicts in Shakespeare and in particular in *Hamlet*, *Othello*, *King Lear* and *Macbeth*. The Elizabethan perspective is a weakness in that other writers appear perhaps less as they were than as the Elizabethans saw them. But this too is something to know. And Mr. Haydn's theory is so strongly buttressed with fact and insight as to be a valuable new tool for understanding the European Renaissance: a

3. See *Essais*, I, xxvi; II, xi; III, xii-xiii, etc. In one case (p. 491; cf. pp. 405, 492) it is Montaigne's earlier thought that is forgotten in favor of his late when Mr. Haydn says that Montaigne does not care for any lesson in how to die. Contrast *Essais*, I, xx.

Incidentally, Mr. Haydn would have helped his reader more in his Rabelais and Montaigne references by giving book and chapter as well as the volume and page of the particular editions he uses. He does this sometimes with Rabelais, never with Montaigne.

stimulus to fresh research for some, an interpretation to reckon with for all. Both in the research and in the reckoning our thinking will be enriched.

DONALD M. FRAME

Columbia University

*Maurice Scève*. Par Verdun L. Saulnier. Paris, Klincksieck, 1948-1949. Tome I<sup>er</sup>, pp. 578. Tome II (notes), pp. 326.

Thierry Maulnier's iconoclastic *Anthologie de la poésie française* (1939) has done much to awaken interest in Maurice Scève, that enigmatic figure of the Lyonnese Renaissance whose three-century-old label of obscurity Sainte-Beuve had peevishly re-affixed, and whom literary historians at best grudgingly credited with having been a bridge between Marot and the Pléiade. Verdun L. Saulnier's definitive work will be read eagerly both by *seiziémistes* and by lovers of poetry who have found in Scève, not obscurity and medieval erudition, but a strange and evocative poetic experience.

While he acknowledges the prior importance of a nontemporal aesthetic criticism of poetry, M. Saulnier states clearly that in the present work his emphasis is historical. It is certainly true that the results of historical research should underlie our aesthetic examination of poetry. In the case of Scève, despite valuable beginnings by Baur, Parturier, and Guégan, we have had to wait until now for a complete study of the man, his works, and his milieu.

We should thus have been grateful for a work which brought forward new biographical data, located Scève with respect to his contemporaries, and, providing an exegesis of his poetry, revealed his importance not only as a precursor but as an influence of the Pléiade. But M. Saulnier does much more than meet these basic needs; his book illuminates for us long-observed aspects of the early Renaissance in France and provides new insights into the techniques of poetic composition in the period. In the process, he displays not only the specialist's knowledge of his period, but a wide understanding of French poetry in every age. His style, both witty and eloquent, is a pleasure to read.

The author first traces Scève's beginnings in a Lyons blossoming under the guidance of such humanists as Symphorien Champier and Barthélemy Buyer. Although the poet's birth date cannot be definitely established, M. Saulnier adduces new evidence which favors 1500, a moment when the enthusiastic belief in a new age of learning was in the air. Thus Scève, like Rabelais, was born with the French Renaissance. New data concerning the poet's family reveal his solid bourgeois origin and the independence characteristic of the worthy burgher helps to explain why, unlike many of his successors, he never sought royal patronage. It was in the spirit of a fellow humanist, who shared Francis I's interest in Petrarch, that Scève

set out, perhaps at the behest of the king, to discover the tomb of Laura. M. Saulnier studies for the first time Scève's rôle in this mysterious affair, and concludes that the discovery neither brought Scève his first fame, as critics have asserted, nor did it contribute to the vogue of Petrarch, as tradition has long alleged.<sup>1</sup>

At Lyons learned society was bourgeois, linked to the court only by the admiration of its members for Marguerite de Navarre, and thus did not share the worldly preoccupations of court poets. A circle of savants to which Scève was early attracted was the *sodalitium* of neo-Latinists, one of the members of which was Dolet, who influenced Scève's first Latin poems. In Scève's interest in the neo-Latinists M. Saulnier sees an early manifestation of his desire to achieve a hermetic style, a *trobar clus*.

Scève's literary career began in 1535 with *Flammette*, a translation of Juan de Flores' *Tractado de Grimalte y Gradissa*, which continues Boccaccio's *Fiammetta*. The poet's *blasons*, composed in 1535-1536, provide the occasion for an original and valuable study of this minor genre, of which Scève's *Blason du sourcil* is a charming example. Here M. Saulnier distinguishes two types of *blason*, the *satirique* and the *médailion*, the first critical and typically medieval, the second a brief, epigrammatic description of an object, usually linked to a painting or an engraving, and thus, like Scève's *Délie* and *Microcosme* and Pontus de Tyard's *Dix fables de fleuves*, further evidence of the close relationship between poetry and the visual arts during the Renaissance.

The experience of composing these minor works, the teachings of Dolet, the predilection for Petrarch, and finally the experience of love, prepare *Délie*. Although she inspires the work, Pernette du Guillet is not the poet's first love; internal evidence proves the existence of an earlier amour in 1520, and although the poems are addressed to *Délie*, often, in writing of his new love, he recaptures the memory of the old. That *Délie* is a work of absence, of the recollection of past loves, probably composed when Scève had finally separated from Pernette, explains, in part at least, its meditative quality, its treatment of the themes *sub specie æternitatis*, resulting in a universality seldom found in the more circumstantial love poetry of the time. Beginning in a mood of Platonistic idealization, the poems soon take on the sensuality of genuine passion; the "bien supérieur," as M. Saulnier points out, is no mere ethereal goal, and Scève is no exemplar of Lyonnese Platonism. Nor is his passion reminiscent of *amour courtois*: *Délie* depicts loved and beloved rather than swain and lady, and as M. Saulnier remarks, if the identities were interchanged, these poems would effectively portray a woman in love.

Scève's famous "obscurity" stems from recognizable devices: rhetorical effects such as definition by repetition ("Ou sa bonté par vertu attractive/ Ou sa vertu par attrayant bonté"); neologisms (Scève is a greater practitioner of *provinement* than the *Pléiade*); mythological allusions of greater or

1. M. Saulnier further discusses the matter in *RLC*, XXIV (1950), 65-78.



lesser difficulty depending on whether figures are directly named or simply suggested by adventures in which they participated (e.g., "les tristes Sœurs pleuroient l'antique offense," an allusion to Philomel and Procne which means simply, "it was spring"); similes and metaphors without an obvious key. Moreover, the difficulty of many lines stems from misprints or errors in punctuation perpetuated in succeeding editions. In Scève's poetry cases of genuine obscurity are rare; the poet simply demands of the reader first a basis of learning, and then an effort of discipline and imagination that makes his poetic experience, in the end, all the more profound.

M. Saulnier produces evidence arguing strongly that the poet spent the three years following the composition of *Délie* in solitude on the Ile-Barbe. During this time the eclogue *Saulsaye* (1547) was composed. Upon his return to society, the poet evinces new interest in human activities; he is the planner of festivities on the occasion of Henri II's ceremonial entry into Lyons, he joins Louise Labé's circle, and, most important of all, participates in the learned discussions of Pontus de Tyard's *cénacle* at Bissy. This group of "curieux," although their methods were essentially medieval, nevertheless enunciated a philosophy that revealed a boundless confidence in man's prowess, spurning traditional systems of thought like the Ptolemaic astronomy, which Copernicus' hypothesis supplants in Tyard's *L'Univers* (1557).<sup>2</sup>

These new pursuits helped to inspire *Microcosme* (1562), the long hymn to progress which celebrated man's achievements through Adam's vision of the future. M. Saulnier analyses this work, neglected by earlier critics, in even greater detail than he does *Délie*. His discussion of the microcosmic tradition, like the treatment of *blasons* an incidental contribution of great value in itself, precedes a thorough study of the sources, meaning, and artistic value of the poem. Some remarkable excerpts (pages 436-437) illustrate Scève's "painterly" talents; the description of Eve's virginal beauty, showing the influence of the *blason*, is a pictorial marvel. The picture of man's progress ends ostensibly with the Redemption. M. Saulnier's explanations for this seem a trifle strained; he suggests (page 478) that had Scève discussed the Middle Ages, he would have been forced to discuss the Renaissance, a period which combines man's achievements with his failure to live at peace, and is thus unsuited to Scève's principal theme of eternal human progress. But the poem does invoke the Renaissance, at least implicitly, and if specific details are lacking, is it not perhaps simply due to Scève's subordinating the achievements of his time to the glories of former ages, in which the source of true human progress is found?<sup>3</sup>

2. Tyard's acceptance of Copernicus was more positive than M. Saulnier seems to realize (pp. 391, 498). Cf. John C. Lapp, *The Universe of Pontus de Tyard*, Cornell Univ. Press, 1950, pp. xliii-xliv, and 196, n. 3.

3. Adam praises man's knowledge of navigation, his discovery of America, and speaks of the sea "calme en peur des experts matelots." Scève's comments here are similar to Tyard's when he praises the navigators "ausquels l'usage et les perils ont accompli l'industrie," and shows how the discoveries they made possible helped to refute ancient geography. Cf. Lapp, *ibid.*, p. xli.



Two final chapters trace Scève's reputation to the present, and sum up the author's claims for his subject. Since Sainte-Beuve, critics have seldom strayed from the four formulae to which M. Saulnier wittily reduces that pontiff's criticism of Scève: "1. Scève c'est *Délie*. 2. Scève le très obscur. 3. Scève l'intermédiaire. 4. Maurice Scève mais Louise Labé." If Brunetière exhumed the poet, it was only to use him as a club to belabor the hated symbolists ("Ni Verlaine ni Mallarmé n'ont rien écrit de plus difficile à interpréter"). Valéry Larbaud's praise, the ample space in Thierry Maulnier's anthology (Scève has 281 lines to Ronsard's 335), were tentative steps; now M. Saulnier's monumental thesis lays solid groundwork for the full appreciation of the poet's genius. What remains to be done is of course a full critical study of the poetry. As noted above, M. Saulnier's emphasis is necessarily historical. His approach to the poetry is exegetical. In this latter domain, while recognizing the heroic demands of M. Saulnier's task, the necessary disciplining of the mass of material with which he had to deal, one might nevertheless regret that he does not at least indicate the path Scévian criticism might take. His very suggestive concluding remarks to Chapter XIX: "au total, deux impressions dominent la sensibilité scévienne au contact de la nature: la lumière et l'humidité. . . Ruissellement de lumière dans la cosmogonie et les rédemptions. . . horreur de l'obscurité dans les tableaux de nuit, de mort et d'enfer," might have been expanded to include the poet's obsession with contrasting darkness and light in certain *dizains* (especially CXXIX and CCCLV). Scève's shrouding of his world in half-light, his reversal of the conventional night-day imagery,<sup>4</sup> call for a study of the baroque element in his poetry.

Further, the poetry of Scève illustrates a vexing critical problem, of which M. Saulnier is undoubtedly aware, but to which he might well have devoted passing attention. This is the question of the dependence of much of Scève's "incantatory" power upon accretions of meaning, a problem Gide recognized when he wrote concerning the lines, "Le Cerf volant aux aboys de l'Austruche/Hors de son giste esperdu s'envola" (*Délie*, XXI): "Scève ne cherche à cacher dans ces vers que des allusions historiques; de même que dans le *dizain* LV où il est également question de Charles-Quint sous figure de 'l'Austruche.' Mais par effort et comme incidemment, il parvient tout de même à cette vertu incantatrice que Mallarmé cherche et obtient directement."<sup>5</sup> The problem is whether, in certain cases, historical exegesis may disperse the poetic aura.<sup>6</sup>

4. Cf. all of *dizain* CCCLV, "L'Aulbe venant pour nous rendre apparent/Ce que l'obscur des tenebres nous cele. . ."

5. *Interviews imaginaires*, New York, Schiffrin, 1943, p. 179. Gide, however, much too cavalierly rejects "tout le reste embroussaillé de sa *Délie*" for the lines "Toute douceur d'Amour est détrempée/De fiel amer et de mortel venin" (CCLXXIII).

6. The problem of increased poetic "parfum" because of archaism or accretion of meaning is broached by H. A. Grubbs, "The Essence of Poetry: a Concept and a Dilemma," in *Yale French Studies*, II (1949), 50. An interesting example is D'Aubigné's line (*Tragiques*, I, 32) ". . . les reins tous ployés des inutiles fleurs," where the modern reading of *reins* may add force to the image.

Moreover, with regard to the two major works, the critical importance of structure should have been taken into account. As M. Saulnier shows, the 449 *dizains* of *Délie* can be grouped according to theme, but there is no controlling structure; each *dizain* must be considered, for critical purposes, a poem in itself—"L'unité de valeur n'est jamais que le dizain, pris à part" (page 218). Thus with regard to the first work, the critic may legitimately make his selection, as with any sonnet sequence of the *Pléiade*. It is quite another matter with *Microcosme*. One may certainly find, in the three thousand lines of this work, many "beaux vers" destinés à hanter la mémoire" (page 525), but this "anthological method" is of doubtful aid in determining the value of a poem conceived as a unit. The fact that, in *Microcosme*, "tout n'est pas égale réussite," must affect our final judgment of the work. Nor is it sufficient to add: "Mais chez Ronsard, et chez Racine, non plus." In Ronsard's case, we reject whole poems, like the *Franciade*; in Racine's, our judgments must have their bases in dramatic values. This statement also illustrates the circumspection with which M. Saulnier moves regarding Scève's contemporary. True, it is not necessary to annihilate Ronsard in order to praise Scève, but the critic may certainly reject what is bad in either poet, and stay well within his rights if he cares to advance reasons why the poetic experience afforded by certain *dizains* is richer than that found in some of the most successful sonnets of the younger poet. A comparative study might show that Scève's *dizain* makes a deeper appeal through the many levels at which poetic experience can be derived from his poetry than the bright tableau or tiny drama of the essentially unistructural Ronsardian sonnet.<sup>7</sup>

Thus the case of Maurice Scève, here so ably presented as man and poet, opens before us new critical vistas. As M. Saulnier remarks at one point: "Il y aurait lieu de retoucher la carte poétique de l'époque." His book provides a powerful impetus toward that very end: the long overdue revaluation and reclassification of sixteenth-century poetry on an aesthetic basis.

JOHN C. LAPP

Oberlin College

*Miguel de Cervantes und sein Don Quijote*. By August Rüegg. Bern, A. Francke, 1949. Pp. 488.

This introduction to Cervantes and his works, to the *Don Quijote* in particular, is more comprehensive than similar attempts made by others. Professor Rüegg's plan of presentation is a discussion of this master novel from a number of different angles, such as "The Character of Don Quijote,"

7. In finding Scève closer to Valéry than to Mallarmé, M. Saulnier seems to slight "incantatory" power, and to concentrate on his poet's rhetorical qualities. Yet certain *dizains* recall Mallarmé's fascination with night as it changes to day, and although M. Saulnier may have considered it too facile, a comparison between *La Saulsaye* and *L'Après-midi d'un faune* reveals interesting similarities of style and structure.

"Sancho," "Dulcinea," "Humor," "Proverbs," and so on. Thus the burning Cervantic problems are revealed more clearly than in the works of Professor Rüegg's predecessors. The different scholarly theories in Cervantic criticism are accepted or rejected with valid arguments, sureness, and decision. The presentation itself, unfortunately, thus becomes aesthetically deficient owing to unavoidable repetitions.

Rüegg accepts only two serious trends in Cervantes criticism, the Anglo-Saxon or realistic one and the German or poetical one. The realistic Quijote interpretation of Byron, Fitzmaurice Kelly, R. Schevill, and others is in complete harmony with the naïve Quijote hermeneutics which has persevered from the seventeenth century up to Vicente de los Ríos: the parody of the chivalrous (and pastoral) novels ridicules at the same time the self-centered romanticism of the hidalgo by giving him Sancho's common sense (page 44) and life "as it is" as a corrective foil and by working out Don Quijote's repentance and conversion before death as an objective lesson of truth. The proponents of a poetic Quijote interpretation, aware of the poor show of prosaic Sancho and life "as such," stress the fact that the hidalgo is an enthusiastic philosophical fool who at least believes in something beyond the materialism of the prosaic characters and who challenges nature through the spirit.

In Professor Rüegg's endeavor to fuse both of these interpretations, there remains a difficulty, of which this most recent critic is well aware: Cervantes, without a doubt, smiled ironically at the intricacy in which self-made ideals, despite their "élan," are condemned to failure just as are materialistic cravings for happiness. But Cervantes, the disillusioned soldier and poet, was nevertheless unwilling to renounce his own illusions.

Thus the creator and the hero possess the same features, that is Don Quijote is actually the double of Cervantes. And why should the author not love his own double? Likewise, the reader, discovering the same weaknesses within himself, sympathizes spontaneously with both the author and the hero.

Professor Rüegg admits that Cervantes shared the Erasmian concept of the fool whose wisdom consists in connivance at agreeable lies, a typical human weakness; he rejects, however, Erasmian nonconformism as far as Cervantes is concerned. Rüegg is convinced that Cervantes had no objection to inquisition, despotism, and expulsion of minorities: the moriscos seem to Cervantes a Trojan horse (page 66), a fifth column (page 411). Yet he understands the hardships involved here for an individual (page 35) like Ricote.

The Dulcinea problem reflects, according to Rüegg, Cervantes' disillusion in love and marriage (pages 54, 209). It is historically interesting that Rüegg compares the "enchanted" Dulcinea phantom with Calderón's ideal beauty phantom Justina. As the latter tempted Saint Cyprian and turned out to be a diabolic phantasma, or a puppet (page 210), so Dulcinea attracted Don Quijote and proved to be a chimera.

A very interesting chapter is on Don Quijote's asceticism (pages 166-173): Don Quijote wins our admiration for his factual renunciation, abstention, and rejection of a comfortable life. But soon we are aware, according to Rüegg, who might be toned down a bit on that score, that Don Quijote wants the knight to compete with the monk (page 146) and his love for a lady to compete with love of God (page 162). We discover, furthermore, that the amorous (page 184) and irascible (pages 171-173) knight is only looking for self-realization, for psychological compensation (page 174), for honors (page 184), glory (page 141), and renown. He even does penance for becoming renowned (page 178). The anachronistic behavior of an imaginary knight, an unsocial individualist who ascribes to himself a messianic mission and thereby causes harm, would be the most objectionable thing in the world. But, again, the "ascete" fills us with melancholy rather than with disgust. He has the "stuff" of a troubadour, poet, and actor (page 182) who fights, suffers, and sacrifices by principle, but fails in concrete situations. We, too, manifest a similar tendency in preaching general ideas of charity, avoiding any obligation in specific cases (page 188). Don Quijote, at least, follows self-made ideologies with courage. Thus, indeed, he is a supreme example of intellectual heroism (page 127).

The pride of Don Quijote, as our critic pertinently remarks, is so strong that in theory he renounces his Dulcinea and his ideal of chastity, though his sensuality is moderate (page 162), whenever there is danger that he might be despised for lack of virility. Again the reader does not object, because his own pride, certainly, would prompt him to similar behavior. Furthermore, Don Quijote with all his weaknesses is not only extremely lovable (page 131) and noble (page 143); but also his resistance to the supposed attractiveness of Maritornes, Doña Rodriguez, Altisidora and Dorothea (page 165) bestows on him "etwas Asketisches" (page 165). Yet far from being perfect he is unfit for life (page 134) owing to his pathological zeal which is the result of a surfeited egoism (page 137) and to his behavior as a stubborn tyrant (page 138). Therefore it is in vain that Unamuno tries to transform him into a Saint, whatever the interpretation of a saint may be (page 184). His predominant quality is not faith (page 149) but a propensity to confuse life and poetry. For this error he will be humiliated (page 193) and he will atone for it on his deathbed. This then is his real asceticism, or in the words of Rüegg:

Der Weg der Askese, nicht der schlechthinigen Abtötung, sondern der zweckhaften Kasteiung und Körperunterwerfung, ist der einzige, der zur Erlösung des Geistigen führt. . . . Das ist der Kern der Dichtung vom Gral und Parcival und der *Göttlichen Komödie*. Der Ritter gewinnt das kostbare Kleinod erst, nachdem er auf den falschen Pfaden der Welt geirrt ist, und nachdem er reuig Busse getan und sich in Demut erniedrigt hat (216).

Rüegg failed to explain *why* he dedicates such a long chapter to the asceticism of Don Quijote, and it is not so sure that he saw the problem

involved here in its fullness. Since the Middle Ages there was a tension between religious asceticism, to which the Church wants to subdue each of her members in diminishing degrees, of course, from the hermit down to the last layman (see article "Asceticism" in D. Attwater, *A Catholic Dictionary*, New York, Macmillan, 1942, page 39), and the professional asceticism of the knight (more modern: the soldier, the sportsman) necessary for keeping him in shape and efficiency in view of his particular task. The Renaissance, rejecting the spiritual asceticism of the Church as inhuman and meaningless, would praise all the more the practically informed "asceticism" of military endurance and drill leading to courageous self-realization, patriotism, and human glory. The Church, acknowledging for all, as just mentioned, only one theocentric ideal of sanctity to be reached by asceticism, Grace helping, and rejecting any kind of natural anthropocentric self-realization, finally had incorporated the chivalric ideal into her own by the *caballero cruzado*, the fighter for God. This concept found a new vitalization in Cervantes' times through Spain's and the whole Occident's fight against the Turks.

The Christian humanist Erasmus was inclined—as in all other matters—to make a compromise between the Christian and the pagan ideal and to admit two fundamentally distinct and legitimate perfections. One perfection is typical of the monk, another of the knight or gentleman, or layman in general. His principal thesis, *pietas non est monachatus*, explains these two perfections. The counteraction against this position was taken by St. Ignatius of Loyola. His point was not to overstress the more or less negligible and variable exterior acts of asceticism anywhere, but to stress everywhere all the more the intention: *omnia ad maiorem Dei gloriam*. The new, Jesuitic, ascetic spirit then consists primarily for everybody, monk and knight, scholar and kitchenmaid, in the supernaturalization of one's actions. Now, the Erasmian knight "avant la lettre" was Amadís de Gaula, knight for his own glory and fighting in order to gain the favor of his lady; the Ignatian knight was Esplandián, the last progeny of the line of Perceval and Galahad, *caballeros a lo divino* (see Samuel Gili Gaya, "Las sergas de Esplandián como crítica de la caballería bretona," *Boletín de la Biblioteca Menéndez y Pelayo*, XXIII [1947], 103-111).

Don Quijote certainly is the Erasmian type of knight, a congenial, very human knight, with a professional asceticism; but on his deathbed he ostensibly repents not to have had the other asceticism for lack of reading books of piety and edification. He curiously experienced with the chivalric romances what, according to Rivadeneyra, St. Ignatius experienced with the works of Erasmus: they kill the ascetic spirituality in the reader. Such considerations and implications would have given Rüegg's surprising and unusual chapter a certain competence in his criticism of the different hypotheses concerning the "Weltanschauung" of Cervantes. Cervantes' bringing about the deathbed conversion of Don Quijote, which certainly is not appended to the novel, shows that he is a follower and admirer of the

Jesuits (M. Cascón, "Los Jesuitas según Cervantes," *Boletín de la Biblioteca Menéndez y Pelayo*, XXIII [1947], 179-211). This question, if it had been raised by Rüegg, would have given full impact to the Erasmian-Ignatian tension in Cervantes' literary treatment of asceticism. It would have made a reasonable contribution to the spiritual unity of the *Quijote* and the *Persiles*.

Spain's fate at the end of the sixteenth century, when after the defeat of the Armada there remained nothing of her glorious past but retrospective, Quijote-like dreamers and Sancho-like materialists (as Rüegg overstresses a bit), was related in a prototypic fashion to the personal fate of Cervantes. The maimed soldier, who had never been duly promoted, continued to look back to his *hazañas* of Lepanto, though he was starving amidst his poetical dreams, while the practical Lope made quick profit by satisfying the realistic taste of the people with his well-arranged plays. This parallel which was keenly felt by Cervantes, according to the demonstrations of Rüegg, gives the story of Don Quijote a normal tinge of "baroque" disillusion, but with the unique and noble restriction that the spirit of chivalry must live on even though chivalry itself is dead.

Rüegg's aesthetical interpretation is less convincing than his philosophical one. An "at random" composition, style parodies (page 57), novels inserted because they were not publishable elsewhere (page 87), and rhetorical snatches seem not to exhaust the art of Cervantes. Unusual, if not disconcerting, is the statement that the humor of Ariosto is more refined than that of Cervantes (page 51). The literary parallels, not only to Garcilaso and Camões, but to later authors such as Rousseau, Walter Scott and Ramuz seem unjustified, to say the least. The same holds true for the comparison of Don Quijote with Achilles, Ariel, Eulenspiegel and Falstaff, as well as that of Sancho with Thersites, Caliban and Robin Hood.

Among the original and very helpful interpretations of Professor Rüegg we note first of all the idea that whosoever tries to cure enthusiastic folly by "enlightenment" will himself succumb, as did Sansón Carasco in his rôle of *Caballero del Bosque*; secondly, the statement that the main episodes of the second part of the novel, the occurrences at the court of the Duques, are scandalous and revolting (page 204).

In Cervantes' forgetting and confusing of names, Rüegg sees simply errors and no "perspectivismo" (page 238): in the Quijotization of Sancho he goes farther than Unamuno and Madariaga (page 266); from Rodríguez Marín's supposed biographical sources for certain adventure elements and Maeztú's biographical parallels, Rüegg derives the right to interpret the *Quijote* as quasi autobiography (page 334), or even as inner destiny (page 377); he strikingly admires Havelock Ellis as an authority on Spain and Cervantes (page 347); he regrets rationalizing tendencies in the interpretation of Cervantes, from which error he exempts Castro (page 388). According to Rüegg, *Don Quijote* is unquestionably the book that provides interior happiness (page 391).

To summarize our impression: though deficient in critical-literary aspects



and poor in its analytical presentation, this introduction has the merit of expounding all important questions of a philosophical and historical nature which, despite some contradictions, are solved reasonably in view of the present state of Cervantes studies.

HELMUT HATZFELD

Catholic University

*El verdadero Dios Pan. Auto sacramental alegórico de Don Pedro Calderón de la Barca.* Texto y estudio por José M. de Osma. (University of Kansas Publications, Humanistic Studies, No. 28) Lawrence, University of Kansas Press, 1949. Pp. 149.

It is only within recent years that there has been a renewed interest in Calderón's *autos*. Several studies by Valbuena Prat, Thomas, a few doctoral dissertations and A. A. Parker's stimulating work (*inter alia*) on *The Allegorical Drama of Calderón* (1943) have given us a revaluation of an important phase of Calderón's dramatic art. Editions of two of Calderón's *autos* were published toward the end of 1949. One of these is *El verdadero Dios Pan* which the editor claims to be a "modesta contribución al examen y valorización del alegorismo y simbolismo en el arte barroco calderoniano," and is announced as the first of a series of projected studies of the allegorical *autos*. The editor proposes to examine the aesthetics, structure, and ideology of the *auto*. He promises a final volume to sum up his observations. The text, a reproduction of the *princeps*, Madrid 1677 (cited as 1676 on page 1 of the "Prefacio") has been modernized and the punctuation corrected. The study is divided into: "Introducción: Pan, Luna, Selene-Endimión, Auto y Mito"; "Texto: Loa, Auto"; "Apéndice (Versificación) and Bibliografía."

The "Introducción" consists mainly of an historical survey of the various concepts of Pan and Luna in mythology and literature. The section on "Auto y Mito" deals very briefly with matters bibliographical; there follows a discussion of the *auto* as defined by Calderón: "sermón en verso, en idea representable," pointing out the symbolism, allegory, baroque splendor on the one hand and the anachronisms, incongruities, conventional devices, etc. on the other. The editor next discusses the affinity between Pan, Luna, and Selene-Endimión, traces the sources of the *auto* and concludes with some critical remarks.

Comments on obscure points of syntax, vocabulary and allusion have been consigned to footnotes. The Appendix contains a detailed analysis of the disposition of meters together with some general observations in which it is stated that a change of verse form does not always coincide with a change of scene.

This reviewer finds the edition lacking in several essential points. In the first place there is no interpretative essay on the *auto*, and its place in the genre as a whole. No mention is made of Calderón's flattery of royalty, allusions to the House of Austria and Carlos II (*Loa*, verses 49, 61). There



is no discussion of possible autobiographical references. For example, is it Calderón who is complaining of the pressure exerted on him by the Ayuntamiento of Madrid for the two annual *autos* in verses 296-302 of the *Loa*?

*No me atrevo  
a que sean buenos, mandados  
hacer de prisa, porque esto  
de versos ha de ser  
prevenido con más tiempo,  
que el que los oye no admite  
la disculpa de lo presto.*

About twenty years had passed since Calderón began grinding out *autos* and perhaps he himself felt the monotony of the genre when he wrote about this one:

*y todo sea nuevo (Loa, verse 154).*

A study of the style—imagery, chiaroscuro (*Loa*, verses 107-108), use of color (verses 606, 607, 1545), rustic language of “simplicidad,” use and abuse of dialectics (verses 416-475, 2041-2045)—would have been richly rewarding. An index of all mythological names mentioned together with page or verse numbers would have been useful.<sup>1</sup>

This volume of *El verdadero Dios Pan* should be a welcome addition to the library of every devotee of the Spanish drama of the Golden Age. It is indeed heartening to see the growing interest in the *autos* from a literary and aesthetic viewpoint, and it is hoped that the task undertaken by Professor Osma will be continued.

EVERETT W. HESSE

*University of Wisconsin*

Denis Diderot: *Le Neveu de Rameau*. Edition critique avec notes et lexique.

Par Jean Fabre. (Textes Littéraires Français) Genève, Droz; Lille, Giard, 1950. Pp. xcv + 329.

This work consists of an introduction, text, one hundred and forty-four pages of notes, a glossary of thirty-two pages, an appendix of five contemporary accounts of Jean François Rameau, and a critical bibliography of two hundred and seventy-two titles. The Introduction is divided into three sections: (1) “Histoire du texte; principes de l’édition”; (2) “Problèmes de genèse et de sources”; (3) “La Signification de l’œuvre.”

The text is a faithful reproduction of the autograph manuscript,<sup>1</sup> now at the Pierpont Morgan Library, which has been the accredited basis for

1. In addition, one may note that the graphic accent is missing from the following words: “Introducción,” “reirse” (p. 1); “oidas,” “César” (p. 9); “Hécate” (p. 18); “debéis” (*Loa*, v. 50); “Némesis” (p. 69, n. 367); “algún” (p. 431); “Fácilmente” (p. 486); “qué” (p. 1057); “mía” (p. 1059). Verses 1356-1377 should be ascribed to Pan.

1. I have avoided the laborious effort of checking the text with the manuscript.

all editions since its discovery by Georges Monval in 1890. Diderot's orthography and punctuation have been preserved, but not his erratic capitalization. An advantage over previous texts is the distinction between Diderot's own proof-reading corrections ( $m^1$ ) and those made later by an unknown hand ( $m^2$ ). The variants are of minor importance. The master manuscript gives the final and definitive form. It is possible that earlier versions may someday be found.

In spite of its divisions, the Introduction is chiefly concerned, from its very beginning, with a thesis. *Le Neveu de Rameau* is found to be a masterpiece, but it is quite distinct from Diderot's other works, in that he is here writing only for himself, for the pure pleasure of writing, for recreation and re-creation, for the need of freeing himself from his impossible materialistic philosophy and its attendant ethical dilemmas by escaping to the higher truths of poetry—in short, gratuitously, for no reason other than the aesthetic urge of the "idée artistique." This main thesis seems to me quite untenable and to be too often based on misconceptions of Diderot's thought.<sup>2</sup> Yet there are many valuable insights and sound critical judgments to be met with along the way. The *Neveu de Rameau*, M. Fabre finds, is a satire in the Horatian sense, not polemics, or it would have been published. It certainly could not have been, however, while Mlle Hus was still alive—and Diderot was fully capable of writing polemics for posterity. More happily, M. Fabre sees in Jean-François Rameau a genuine historical personality, a natural *monstre* ("le monstre garantit le génie"), who called for and received no distortion,<sup>3</sup> and was transfigured but not betrayed. M. Fabre even finds the unity of the work, not in a thesis, but in the nephew's presence, and accounts for its artistic success through the meeting of the man with Diderot's great aesthetic urge of the moment. His sympathy for Rameau is explained, not on moral grounds, but by his own serious questioning of his genius,<sup>4</sup> for both had "la même conscience de l'échec." And since Diderot's *alter ego* is this time a creature of ideas, as well as of flesh and blood, it is unjustifiable to ascribe those ideas to Diderot without a careful collection of corroborative evidence from his other works. This M. Fabre has done with commendable assiduity in his notes.

The weakness of M. Fabre's main thesis can be accounted for by his lack of sympathy, even the sympathy that comes through understanding, for the eighteenth century in general and for the whole Diderot in par-

2. M. Fabre, whose most quoted philosophical authority is Pierre du Noüy, suggests, for example, that Diderot's ethical system, carried to its logical conclusions, must lead, in the political domain (and in spite of his denials), to enlightened despotism or even the dictatorship of the proletariat (p. lxxvii). It is clear that Diderot has here fallen among the modern counterparts of his eighteenth-century enemies. He would be more fairly and sympathetically viewed by the authors of *The Scientific Spirit and Democratic Faith* (New York, King's Crown Press, 1944).

3. This is the contention of Milton F. Seiden in "Jean François Rameau and Diderot's Neveu," in *Diderot Studies*, Syracuse University Press, 1950.

4. This aspect, envisaged by Goethe, is more fully and convincingly developed by Rudolf Schlösser, *Rameaus Neffe*, Berlin, 1900. See below.

ticular. The *Neveu de Rameau* is not so unique as he would have us believe. Certainly many of the *Salons*, *Le Rêve de d'Alembert*, and *Jacques le fataliste* were written under the same aesthetic and philosophical compulsion. The *Rêve* is the noblest and most poetic expression that Diderot gave to his philosophical ideas—and there is poetry even in many of the articles of the *Encyclopédie*. Did the poet, in the *Neveu* alone, give the lie to the *philosophe*? Chronology also works against the thesis. The *Neveu* is relatively early, written in its essentials in 1761, at the height of Diderot's encyclopedic enthusiasm. If it was an escape, it was not an escape from his philosophic beliefs. His major materialistic commitments will come later.

M. Fabre speaks early in his discussion (page ix) of Diderot's "friends," who conspired to rob him of his repose: "Chacun exploite à sa façon son complaisant génie: la tsarine pour sa propagande, le baron pour son système, Grimm pour ses feuilles, Naigeon contre 'l'infâme'." He then quotes from a letter to Sophie Volland of November 15, 1768: "Ces gens-là ne veulent pas que je sois moi: je les planterai tous là et je vivrai dans un trou; il y a longtemps que le projet me roule par la tête." But if the letter is read in its context, the weaknesses of the argument appear: the Naigeon reference is wholly gratuitous; five years later Diderot was urging Catherine II to sponsor a new Encyclopedia; Diderot seems greatly to have enjoyed his visits to Grandval, but at that moment his very intimate friend Damilaville was mortally ill; and finally he was temporarily put out because Grimm had made him trot a prince around Paris! Grimm's *Correspondance* continued to be the main outlet for his poetic genius. He was, as he wrote the letter, just finishing his glorious *Salon* of 1767, excelling that of 1765, of which he had written to Sophie Volland (November 10, 1765): "C'est certainement la meilleure chose que j'ai faite depuis que je cultive les lettres." That all happened several years after the essential redaction of the *Neveu de Rameau* and before the letter quoted above. To suit the thesis, M. Fabre also presents Diderot as hardly competent in musical matters and as having lost his interest in music at an impossibly early date. For these and other reasons which it is unnecessary to discuss, it seems evident that Diderot enthusiasts will read the Introduction with interest, but without submission.

Le *Neveu de Rameau* is, as M. Fabre concludes, a satire and a "farce-tragédie," and it is also a *sotie*, more in keeping with that genre than Gide's *Caves du Vatican*. But in reverse of his editor's opinion, Diderot's "folie" was clearly not an end-product, but a method of arriving at "sagesse": the mask was Diogenes', the true visage that of Socrates. Neither *Les Eleuthéromanes* nor the self-mocking epitaph that Diderot wrote for Mme de Meaux can be taken at face value. M. Fabre intends no disparagement. But in holding that poetic folly is philosophically superior to philosophy itself, he is betraying the very essence of Diderot's thought and intent.

Since the *Neveu de Rameau* is an account of the historically "true," the work of annotation presents difficulties, which M. Fabre has succeeded

admirably in overcoming. The Parisian settings, contemporary events, literary and musical allusions are fully explained and identifications are made of the many persons mentioned by name. Monval, Thoinan, Pomnier, Mornet, and Venturi are the sources most commonly referred to. Schlösser's work appears in the Bibliography, but there is no evidence either in the Introduction or in the Notes that M. Fabre consulted it. The more is the pity, because the German work of 1900 is relatively inaccessible and has hardly been surpassed. Schlösser pushed the historical investigation far beyond that of the Monval edition and used it for very definitely critical purposes, such as determining the date of composition, the nature, extent, and time of the additions or interpolations, the structure, and finally the significance and evaluation of the work as a whole. In comparison, M. Fabre's notes appear to be a compilation of facts unrelated to his criticism. Following Goethe's lead, Schlösser found in the success of *Les Philosophes* and the failure of *Le Père de famille* the main motivation of the *Neveu*, and although he, too, was convinced of the historical veracity of the portrait of Jean-François Rameau, he concluded that Diderot's work began as a bitter personal satire, based upon his suspicions that the Bertin-Hus clique had much to do with both events. Gradually the personal satire achieves universality and the author finds relief in his artistic triumph. Many critics, including M. Fabre, have repeated Goethe's praise of "la composition si savamment ordonnée," but Schlösser alone attempted a structural analysis.

M. Fabre's edition is an indispensable manual for teachers of eighteenth-century literature. They will find there all they need to know of the historical background and linguistic peculiarities of *Le Neveu de Rameau*. Critics will at least find inspiration. The interpretations of Diderot's masterpiece are already so numerous and various as to justify its comparison, by Schlösser again, with *Hamlet* and *Don Quixote*.

NORMAN L. TORREY

Columbia University

*French Tragedy in the Time of Louis XV and Voltaire, 1715-1774.* By Henry Carrington Lancaster. Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1950. 2 vols. Pp. xii + 662.

This book is the logical continuation of the author's previous works on the history of the French classical theater. He explains in his "Foreword" how circumstances obliged him to confine himself to tragedy, but it is not quite clear why he did not complete the century up to the Revolution. By way of further limitation Professor Lancaster gives a detailed account only of those tragedies acted by the Comédie Française. The first chapter entitled "Patrons, Critics and Actors" presents in concise form all the important information available about the functioning of the Comédie Française, the composition of the troupe, and so on. The author had a microfilm copy of the complete *Registres*, the business records of the troupe. No one has

made such extensive use of these records. From this source he has obtained a certain number of new facts and has been able to correct some previously published information, so that he gives us the most authentic and comprehensive picture of the various aspects of this theater.

After this initial chapter Professor Lancaster proceeds to a discussion of plays, after the manner employed in his earlier histories. In general he follows chronological order, though he violates this procedure in a few instances for practical reasons. All the tragedies that come within the scope of this work are analyzed and criticized in a most thorough manner. A particularly significant contribution is the careful attention given to sources of plot material. His great familiarity with the earlier French theater enables Professor Lancaster to give many comparisons with earlier plays and to show how often they are sources for the dramatists that he is now discussing. All other types of sources have also been checked and evaluated. By consulting the *Registres* he is able to offer new factual information about the performances of almost every play. This careful attention to first hand sources of information permits him to correct many misstatements of fact of earlier commentators and historians. The method of presentation employed brings to light the fact that about the middle of the century there was a noticeable, though brief, return to subjects taken from Sophocles, Euripides, Seneca, and Homer. I do not recall this phenomenon having been noted before. By the same method we are clearly shown the ever increasing indifference to classical usage, especially after 1760. The extent of this laxity, some of which may be attributable to foreign influence, is surprising.

For each play Professor Lancaster cites what he considers to be the most important contemporary and modern criticism. It is difficult to see the immediate value of some of this criticism. When it runs to two or three pages, as it sometimes does, it is likely to bewilder the reader unless he takes time carefully to study the play and is aware of the highly prejudiced attitude of such critics as Grimm, Collé, and La Harpe. One wonders if it would not have been adequate to have summarized in a paragraph or two the main points of adverse and favorable criticism, with footnote references to guide those who might wish to make a more detailed investigation. It must be added in fairness to Professor Lancaster that he gives us in varying degree his own judicious estimate of each play.

Voltaire dominated the tragic stage in France during the period covered by these two volumes. They will undoubtedly be consulted most often because he figures so prominently in their pages. Nowhere else has Voltaire the dramatist received such thorough and intelligent attention. This will almost certainly remain the definitive study of this aspect of this author. The summary and estimate beginning on page 607 is recommended to those who wish to find a brief yet comprehensive and authoritative survey of Voltaire's contributions in the field of tragedy.

Similarly the final chapter entitled "Conclusion" presents the best

outline of the history of eighteenth-century French tragedy to be found anywhere. One might only wish to have also Professor Lancaster's opinion of the influence of censorship on its development.

There is no reference to several worthwhile articles. One of these is P. Martino's "L'Interdiction du *Mahomet* de Voltaire et la dédicace au pape" (*Publications de l'Institut des Hautes Etudes Marocaines*, XVIII, 89 ff.). Another is E. P. Dargan's excellent study, "Shakespeare and Ducis," (*Modern Philology*, 1912). Then there is Pierre Valentin's *Buirette de Belloy sa vie, ses œuvres, 1727-1775* (Murat, n.d.), which contains a good deal of valuable documentary material. The only copy of this rare little monograph that I have been able to locate is in the Archives of the Comédie Française. It is quite possible that Professor Lancaster is familiar with the above publications, but for some reason decided not to list them. Certainly he gives most of the essential facts contained in them, possibly obtained from other sources, but it seems worth while to point them out because of their more extended discussion of their respective subjects. Aside from several unfortunate misprints in dates—page 305 (1950 for 1750), page 590 (1667 and 1669 for 1767 and 1769), page 624 (1660 for 1760)—there are very few typographical errors for such an extensive work.

I cannot help wondering if Professor Lancaster considered trying to have a look, in the Archives of the Comédie Française, at the manuscripts of some of the tragedies with which he is concerned. The majority of these manuscripts are prompter's copies. As such they may give interesting information on the form and manner in which the plays were performed. Perhaps the information to be derived from these manuscripts is too special to have been of use, but it may be of value to those who make a more detailed study of plays for which such manuscripts exist.

This book will be most useful as a work of reference. We owe a great debt of gratitude to Professor Lancaster for having made such a thorough investigation of one of the most important aspects of the eighteenth-century theater. He has given us what will undoubtedly remain a definitive study in the history of the development of tragedy.

C. D. BRENNER

*University of California*

Chateaubriand. *Le Livre du Centenaire*. Par Georges Collas, Amédée Outrey, Louis Martin-Chauffier, Pierre Moreau, Armand Weil, Pierre Clarac, Charles H. Pouthas, Victor-L. Tapié, H. Le Savoureux, Marie-Jeanne Durry, Yvon Delbos, Maurice Levailant. Paris, Flammarion, 1949. Pp. 328.

This volume, composed of disconnected chapters on the varied activities of Chateaubriand, gives an excellent picture of his versatility and dynamism and symbolizes, by its disconnectedness, the man whose life and work is characterized by discontinuity.<sup>1</sup>

1. The chapter headings are: "La Jeunesse bretonne" (Collas); "Le Voyageur" (Outrey); "Le Romancier: des *Natchez* à l'*Abencérage*" (Martin-Chauffier); "L'Au-



Chateaubriand wrote of himself: "Dans l'existence intérieure et théorique, je suis l'homme de tous les songes: dans l'existence extérieure et pratique l'homme des réalités." It is this duality that creates Chateaubriand's restlessness and the disquietude that one senses in all his works. More than that, the want of tranquillity is due to the perfectionist who is in constant search for the absolute whether as lover, diplomat, historian, traveler, novelist, or writer of memoirs, in a world which lacks substance to satisfy the desires of the idealist: "Quand nous parlions du monde, c'était de celui que nous portions au-dedans de nous, et qui ressemblait bien peu au monde véritable." As M. Levaillant has very well put it: "La Sylphide n'est pas seulement le symbole de l'inaccessible amour; elle devient le symbole de l'absolu. La tentation de Chateaubriand, vieux ou jeune . . . c'est la tentation de Faust: par la violence de son désir, le poète veut s'unir, au-delà de la femme, à l'âme profonde de l'univers, se confondre avec le principe des choses, ravir le secret de Dieu,—se faire Dieu!" This struggle for the absolute is the leitmotif of the book written by different mature critics who are interested in the universal. The approach leads to the understanding of the human side. Does it lead to an appreciation of Chateaubriand's art? If so, it is regrettable that the two greatest contributions he made to literary art, as a "paysagiste" and as a "styliste"<sup>2</sup> have been neglected. If Chateaubriand was ever moved to tears, he was moved to tears by his own art. Not that we wished to be moved to tears, but in these excellent centenary pages, we would have liked a partial answer to what constitutes the art of the Enchanteur, and we were left disappointed.

EMILE MALAKIS

The Johns Hopkins University

*Byron, Hobhouse and Foscolo: New Documents in the History of a Collaboration.* By E. R. Vincent. Cambridge, University Press, 1949. Pp. viii + 135.

When the Fourth Canto of *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage* was published, at the end of April, 1818, there was published also a volume of *Historical Illustrations of the Fourth Canto of Childe Harold: Containing Dissertations on the Ruins of Rome; and an Essay on Italian Literature*, by Byron's friend and literary adjutant, John Cam Hobhouse. Hobhouse, however, had not felt competent to write the essay on Italian literature, which was to deal with recent and contemporary Italian writers; and as late as March 23, 1818, the essay had not been begun. Then Hobhouse met Foscolo, who had

teur du Génie et le christianisme" (Moreau); "La Langue et le style dans les premières œuvres" (Weil); "Le Pamphlétaire et le journaliste" (Clarac); "Le Diplomate et le ministre" (Pouthas); "L'Historien" (Tapié); "Introduction à une psychologie de C." (Le Savoureux); "La Vieillesse de René" (Durry); "Les Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe" (Levaillant); "Le Centenaire" (Delbos).

2. M. Weil deals essentially with language and not the art of his expression.



been living in England since 1816, and asked him, as a favor, for his help. Foscolo promptly produced a document of considerable length, which Hobhouse put into English, making some additions, and incorporated in his *Historical Illustrations*. No indication of Foscolo's authorship was desired by either man, and none was given. The *Essay* consists essentially of discussions of Cesarotti, Parini, Alfieri, Pindemonte, Monti—and Foscolo. It is a good piece of work, worthy to be ranked with Foscolo's other critical essays.

When copies of the *Illustrations* reached Milan, Lodovico di Breme and others immediately concluded, on sufficient internal evidence, that the *Essay* was really the work of Foscolo, and took offense in particular at the fact that Di Breme was not mentioned, at what they regarded as the undue prominence given to Foscolo himself, and at the dismissal of the classic-romantic debate as an "idle enquiry." The storm that ensued never entirely died away. Byron, distant and unconcerned, merely laughed his cruel laugh; but the consequences for both Foscolo and Hobhouse were unfortunate. Foscolo specifically denied that he had had anything to do with the *Essay*; and Hobhouse never fully acknowledged that it was not his own work, though he did write, in 1859, in a note added to a reprint of the *Essay*:

The materials for the foregoing *Essay* were furnished to me by an Italian exile, whose assistance I could not avow without compromising him with his fellow-countrymen, and perhaps, embarrassing his pursuits in England. The critical judgments were from my friend; the language and adaptation to English literature were, of course, my own.

Relations between Foscolo and Hobhouse became badly strained, for various reasons; but Foscolo spent some time in the preparation of material to be used by Hobhouse in a projected history of Napoleonic Italy. This project was not carried through; and the association of the two men came to an unhappy end in 1824.

This story, previously known only in part and very inadequately, is now set forth in detail by Professor Vincent, who had access to the Hobhouse family papers, and received permission to publish a considerable amount of previously unpublished material. Fourteen letters of Foscolo—all in French—are here printed for the first time, as well as a few others previously published only in part or from drafts preserved among the Foscolo papers. Letters from Hobhouse to Foscolo, extracts from Hobhouse's diary, and other relevant documents complete the evidence. The book is really an edition, and a fine edition, of this material. The introductory and linking narratives are fully informed and judicious; the letters are evidently printed with exact textual fidelity; and the annotation is excellent.

ERNEST H. WILKINS

Harvard University

*The Life and Times of Henry Monnier. 1799-1877.* By Edith Melcher. Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1950. Pp. xiv + 254.

L'étude des auteurs dits secondaires dans ce très riche dix-neuvième siècle français récompense et récompensera encore longtemps les chercheurs et les curieux. Bien des petits poètes du romantisme, ou de ceux qui unirent Baudelaire au romantisme attardé, comme Pétrus Borel, ou des précurseurs du mouvement poétique contemporain comme Tristan Corbière, Charles Cros, Germain Nouveau nous restent mystérieux. L'histoire des idées littéraires du siècle, qui est en partie celle de la critique, y compris la critique d'art, reste à faire et attend un certain nombre de monographies sur lesquelles elle devra s'appuyer: Michiels, Chaudesaigues, Babou, Thoré-Burger, Hennequin, Fénéon et d'autres méritent une étude. Dans le roman, à côté de Duranty ou de Champfleury, qui demandent à être traités ou retraités, de Jules Vallès qui l'a été et définitivement, Henry Monnier depuis longtemps attendait son champion.

Le sujet était difficile, comme tous les beaux sujets. Car la biographie était mal connue; l'homme risquait d'apparaître médiocre bien que, ou parce que, typique d'un certain genre de littérateurs bons à tout faire, bohèmes, bons vivants, mais déplorablement dépourvus de cette immuable concentration intérieure où Baudelaire, à la suite d'Emerson, voyait le plus clair du génie. L'auteur avait été acteur, artiste de quelque renom, ami de plus grands que lui qui s'étaient à l'occasion servis de lui. Il restait célèbre comme le créateur d'un type qui l'avait dévoré lui-même. Mais il se prêtait mal à une biographie psychologique, car sa psychologie se réduisait à bien peu de chose. Peu de déchirements en lui, pas de lettres intimes, de journal d'égotisme, de tortures du créateur, d'affaires du technicien en lutte avec une matière première rebelle. Son don, a dit Baudelaire de Monnier dans "Quelques caricaturistes français," est "la froideur, la limpidité du miroir, d'un miroir qui ne pense pas et qui se contente de réfléchir les passants." Et Baudelaire avait au préalable porté sur lui ce verdict cinglant: "Monnier ne sait rien créer, rien idéaliser, rien arranger."

Mais Henry Monnier embrasse dans sa vie littéraire cinquante des années les plus remplies du siècle. Il éclaire Balzac et les diverses tentatives pour rapprocher le roman de la peinture de la réalité moyenne; il aide à apprécier Gavarni et même Daumier. Sa vie nous renseigne sur l'existence de l'homme de lettres pendant ce que l'on appelle la révolution industrielle et la révolution romantique. Elle offre une tranche fort curieuse du dix-neuvième siècle. Miss Melcher a très bien compris que son livre devait sans cesse dépasser Monnier et devenir une étude d'histoire sociale autant et plus que d'histoire littéraire. Elle a, à travers des années d'une quête patiente, accumulé les renseignements fournis sur son personnage par les écrivains et les journaux du temps. Elle a mis en œuvre ses matériaux avec beaucoup d'adresse; elle a évité l'écueil des monographies consacrées à des auteurs du deuxième ou du troisième rayon: l'illusion d'optique qui grossit indûment le mérite modeste et exagère la sympathie. Une ou deux fois, elle s'est

permis quelques remarques un tantinet naïves (pages 104-105 sur la sensibilité de Monnier à propos de l'intérêt qu'il prit à deux Arabes condamnés au bagne de Toulon, ou page 123 et ailleurs sur le rôle joué par l'habitude de fumer le cigare pour faire quitter aux fumeurs les salons convenables et les jeter dans les bras accueillants du demi-monde); sa tendresse pour l'enfance de Monnier sous l'Empire, sa vie d'employé, ses mystifications et ses farces est un peu trop indulgente. Mais il est naturel que dans l'existence un peu conventuelle à laquelle convient nos collègues américains, on se divertisse rétrospectivement des plaisanteries et des farces de rapins auxquelles se complurent Monnier, Balzac, Gautier ou Mérimée. L'époque dite romantique fut loin, après tout, de ne compter que des éplorés d'amour phtisiques ou des désespérés.

L'ouvrage de Miss Melcher entremêle avec art l'étude de l'œuvre et le récit de la vie de Monnier, les tentatives du caricaturiste, de l'auteur dramatique et du mémorialiste qui puisa beaucoup en lui-même pour donner vie à son Joseph Prudhomme. Il est constamment agréable à lire, excellemment informé, dénué de tout pédantisme, mais solide et perspicace. Peut-être manque-t-il un peu de cette prise de possession vigoureuse du sujet qui lui aurait infusé l'intensité d'intérêt qui manque aux œuvres de Monnier relues aujourd'hui. Le rôle de Monnier reste considérable parmi ceux qui, vers le milieu du siècle dernier, satirisèrent le bourgeois. Joseph Prudhomme, par le naturel avec lequel il énonce ses platitudes, par la sympathie involontaire avec laquelle l'a tracé son créateur, est resté plus vrai pour beaucoup que Monsieur Homais, Monsieur Poirier ou Tribulat Bonhomet. Sans l'avoir très clairement voulu, Henry Monnier occupe ainsi une place considérable parmi ceux qui, entre 1830 et 1860, creusèrent le fossé entre la classe moyenne, dépeinte comme matérialiste, philistine, bêtement sentimentale et placidement égoïste, pompeuse et sans charité du cœur, et les artistes et les écrivains. Les auteurs américains du vingtième siècle qui naturaliseront chez eux ces types devenus Babbit ou Elmer Gantry devront beaucoup au réalisme ainsi qu'au don de caricature sociale de Monnier et de ses pareils. L'influence des lettres (et du grand Daumier) pour déconsidérer la bourgeoisie et contribuer sans le vouloir à la critique marxiste de cette classe sera énorme. Il y a là un cas d'action de la littérature sur l'histoire et sur la vie qui attend encore son historien.

Longtemps avant de tomber sur cette création de Joseph Prudhomme, Henry Monnier avait, dès 1830, donné dans ses *Scènes populaires* un modèle de réalisme intégral, sténographique. Son don de mimétisme lui avait permis de reproduire avec une fidélité rarement égalée les gestes, les tics, les phrases de la portière, de la grisette, de l'accusé, de l'employé. Les problèmes que pose ce réalisme en pleine ère dite romantique valaient la peine d'être esquissés avec plus d'ampleur que ne leur en a accordé Miss Melcher, qui a mis l'accent sur l'homme plus que sur l'auteur. Historiquement, ce réalisme total dès 1830, et ce qu'il y aura peu après de réalisme chez Balzac et chez Hugo, chez Charles de Bernard et Eugène Sue, et même dans

la poésie de Sainte-Beuve et dans *Jocelyn*, montre bien la fausseté de la thèse d'Irving Babbitt soutenant que le réalisme était sorti du romantisme et avait suivi la désillusion des rêves trop fous; le réalisme était pour lui le romantisme rampant à quatre pattes, comme devait logiquement le faire tôt ou tard un mouvement issu du néfaste Rousseau. La vérité est qu'il y a beaucoup de réalisme au sein même du romantisme, même si c'est parfois un réalisme à base de ferveur affective, comme avait été en Angleterre celui de Crabbe, de Cowper, de Wordsworth assez souvent, avide de simplicité et de diction dépouillée.

Considérée en soi, cette volonté de reproduire photographiquement le réel et notamment les dialogues désespérément bourrés d'idées reçues et de formules toutes faites, que nul ne posséda au XIX<sup>e</sup> siècle au même degré que Monnier, servit de modèle à ne pas suivre à ses successeurs dits réalistes. Car il y aurait tout un livre à écrire sur l'anti-réalisme du réalisme français. Ce réalisme comprit vite qu'il n'y a pas moyen de se passer, si l'on veut faire vrai, soit de quelque truculence comme en avaient possédé Charles Sorel ou Furetière, soit de quelque vivacité et piquant comme chez Rétif, soit et plus encore du seul vrai réalisme qui interprète et compose, et suggère la vie intérieure derrière l'imitation des gestes et des attitudes. Presque tout le réalisme français, à commencer par Balzac, abhorra la tentative de Monnier. Champfleury lui-même, pourtant si peu artiste, ami et historien de Monnier, publiant en 1857 un livre, le *Réalisme*, où il louait le réalisme de Diderot et de Challes, écrivait, bien avant la célèbre phrase de Zola: "La reproduction de la nature par l'homme ne sera jamais une reproduction ni une imitation; ce sera toujours une interprétation." Flaubert, qui dut peut-être à Monnier plusieurs traits de Monsieur Homais, n'a cessé de vitupérer contre la platitude et la médiocrité du réalisme. Dans les lettres à Tourgueneff récemment publiées par Gérard-Gailly, il se disait indigné (à propos du *Nabab* de Daudet) par ce "matérialisme"; et il affirmait la vanité de tentatives, analogues à celle de Monnier, pour voir et copier. "Il ne s'agit pas seulement de voir, il faut arranger et fondre ce que l'on a vu. La réalité, selon moi, ne doit être qu'un tremplin." A cet égard, l'influence négative de ce réalisme intégral tenté dès 1830 par Henry Monnier a été considérable. A sa satire du bourgeois prudhommesque, Monnier, cependant sorti lui-même des ateliers des lithographes et des illustrateurs, n'avait pas ajouté le goût de l'art et l'exploration de la vie intérieure qui seront les vertus classiques des prétendus "réalistes" français de 1850-1870.

HENRI PEYRE

Yale University

*Essai pour une histoire structurale du phonétisme français.* Par A. G. Haudricourt et A. G. Juilland. Paris, Klincksieck, 1949. Pp. xiv + 147.

This work is intended for students of linguistics, whatever their particular fields. It aims at illustrating, by means of examples taken from

various Gallo-Romance dialects, how the structural approach to linguistic research can be applied to the study of phonological evolution. Those who are not already acquainted with the work of the Linguistic Circle of Prague and its followers will undoubtedly find the book revolutionary.

Basic to structural linguistics is the concept of a language, not as a mere inventory of phenomena, but as a system, or, better perhaps, as a structural complex of various patterns, phonemic, morphological, and others. In the phonic domain, the phoneme is identified by its position in the phonemic pattern and its oppositions to the other members of the pattern. Now, if the phoneme is integral with the system, it follows that the evolution of the one is inseparable from that of the other, and phonology will amount to studying and, if possible, accounting for, the evolution of the system.

Since the publication of R. Jakobson's *Remarques sur l'évolution phonologique du russe* in 1929, this book is the first large-scale attempt to apply the structural approach to phonological evolution. In the course of the last two decades only two linguists had published works devoted to historical phonemics, A. Martinet (who wrote the "Préface" to the present *Essai*), and N. van Wijk. The former, by the way, was Haudricourt's teacher for about six years; and had Haudricourt not been absent when the *Essai* was published, we should probably have been told to what extent he was indebted to his teacher for the development of the ideas in the work. The *Essai* is truly unique.

In the "Introduction" and the ten compact chapters of this book, Haudricourt and Juilland present and exemplify the most important principles according to which structural linguistics undertakes to account for various baffling phonological phenomena, particularly those changes heretofore called "unconditioned" or "spontaneous." In order to convey a concrete idea of the structural approach, a brief summary, with examples, of the main points made by the authors concerning phonological changes is here presented.

Two fundamental types of phonological changes are distinguished:

A) Phonetic changes of a type whereby a phoneme  $\alpha$  will develop a "combinatory variant"  $\alpha'$  in certain positions. A subsequent change, by making identical the contexts in which  $\alpha$  and  $\alpha'$  appear, will change  $\alpha'$  into a new phoneme  $\beta$ . For this phonemicization ("phonologisation") of a variant, two illustrations can be adduced: (1) Vulgar Latin did not distinguish phonemically between long and short vowels, but a phoneme  $a$  would tend to be short in *\*allo*, long in *\*alo*; by conversion of geminates into simple consonants *\*allo* became *ālo* and *\*alo* became *ālo*, whereby the distinctive value of consonant length was transposed to vowel length, making the latter a phonemic feature of the language. (2) Northern Gallo-Romance  $k$  became  $k'$  before  $a$ ;  $k'$  was so far nothing but a variant of the  $k$  phoneme, but when  $au$  became  $o$  (as in *causa* > *chose*)  $k'au$  became  $k'o$ , and as  $ko$  existed in the language,  $k'$  became a phoneme distinct from  $k$ .

B) Another type consists of changes which are conditioned by factors inherent in the structure of the system. Of these factors there are two types: (1) The tendency of the system to maintain its equilibrium: thus (Chapter III) the shift of free accented *a* to *e*, *ai*, as in *mare* > *mer*, *manu* > *main*, in Old French is accounted for; Gallo-Romance had two opposed series of stressed free vowels, front (*i*, *e*, *ɛ*) and back (*u*, *o*, *ɔ*), with *a* lowest of all and in the center. When the diphthong *au* began the shift *au* > *ao* > *o*, thus adding another member to the back series, then *a* began the shift *a* > *ae* > *e*, thus joining the front series and maintaining the structural equilibrium of the vowel system. (2) The tendency of the system to maintain the distinction of significant oppositions, that is, to prevent the confusion of phonemes: thus is explained (Chapter III) the origin of the Old French diphthongs. During the process of the shifts *a* > *æ* > *e* and *au* > *ao* > *o*, there must have existed a front series *i*, *ɛ*, *æ* and a back series *u*, *o*, *ɔ*, *ao*. The danger of confusing or merging *ɛ*, *æ* and *o*, *ɔ* as the result of this crowding was averted by their diphthongization as *ei*, *ie* and *ou*, *uo*, respectively, while *æ* > *e*, and *ao* > *o*; hence the two new series *i*, *ei*, *ie*, *e* opposed to *u*, *ou*, *uo*, *o*.

The authors fail to mention another important point concerning internal factors, which, however, is discussed in the "Préface" by A. Martinet. It is that the possibility of the merger of two opposed phonemes may depend on three internal factors: (1) The "functional yield" of the opposition (the number of pairs of words that are distinguished from each other only by means of the single opposition, e.g. *a*—*a* as in *patte*—*pâte*). (2) The phonetic qualities of the opposition (two neighboring nasal vowels are more easily merged, e.g. *ê*—*œ* as in *brin*—*brun*, than the corresponding oral vowels, *ɛ*—*æ*). (3) The degree to which the opposition is integrated in the system (the distinction or opposition between *ɸ* and *ʋ*, as in *mouth* n. and *mouth* v., in English could be dispensed with without creating many homonyms, but it is supported by the fact that the same opposition of *voiced-voiceless* is used to distinguish many other pairs of phonemes).

Haudricourt and Juilland point out that structural linguistics, though primarily concerned with internal factors like those mentioned above, does not exclude external factors, but that it does distinguish those which they describe as "inherent in human nature" and universally the same from those that vary from one language to another. Among the external factors of the first type is what the authors call the "asymétrie foncière des organes de parole," which seems to have a profound effect upon the equilibrium of phonological systems. This was demonstrated for the first time by A. Martinet at the Third International Congress of Phonetic Sciences (*Proceedings*, pages 30 ff.). Because the aperture in the back part of the mouth is considerably less than in the front, there is a resistance against the acquisition of new vowels in the back series and sometimes a tendency to reduce their number. This factor accounts for the late reduction of Old French *au* > *o* in contrast to the readiness of *a* to shift to *e*; it also accounts for the fronting of *u* > *ü*. Chapter X deals quite thoroughly with the origin



of the phoneme  $\bar{u}$  not only in Old French but also in Ancient Greek, Swedish, and the contemporary Portuguese of the Azores. In each case it is shown that  $\bar{u}$  was originally  $u$ , that  $o$  shifted to  $u$ , and that these shifts began when the back series had at least four degrees of aperture.

The most important external factor of the second, or variable, type is, according to the authors, the influence of other linguistic systems. They believe, however, that changes taking place after the disappearance of the substratum language can be caused by the latter only through an intermediary change of structure brought about while the substratum still existed. Thus is explained (Chapter V, Part I) the shift of  $f > h$  in Castilian and Gascon, whose systems have changed from correlations of four series of consonants to correlations of three series. Two other important influences attributed to the substratum languages are the acquisition by Vulgar Latin of a free accent with a differentiatory value and the difference in the time of the disappearance of vowel quantity in the various regions. We have noted, on the other hand, that the Gallo-Romance shift of  $u > \bar{u}$  is accounted for without recourse to the substratum theory; indeed, three pages (100, 101, 104) are devoted to a review and refutation of hypotheses that ascribe  $u > \bar{u}$  to the Celtic substratum. Anti-substratists will be pleased with the conclusion to Chapter IV (on the disappearance of geminates): "... disons que la considération structurale (et, implicitement fonctionnelle) des faits du langage peut, dans bien des cas, éviter au linguiste le recours à des hypothèses aussi hasardées et, fort souvent, invérifiables que celles de substrat."

There are in the book quite a few inconsistencies, as when two deviating evaluations are given of the rôle of the Germanic superstratum in the Old French acquisition of vowel quantity. In Chapter II (page 36) it is called "un appui inespéré," but in the "Introduction" (page 7) we find "... l'influence germanique a reporté la valeur significative..." When the authors, referring to the shift from the Latin to the Romance vowel systems, state (Chapter I, page 18): "... il est téméraire de donner à entendre, comme on le fait généralement [here they refer to Bourciez's *Éléments*, page 42], que la disparition de la quantité a précédé de peu l'apparition du timbre," they seem to be setting up a straw man in order to knock him down. What Bourciez says is: "... perdirent peu à peu les nuances quantitatives, et en vinrent à ne plus se distinguer que par des timbres différents. Lorsque la quantité classique s'effaça sous l'influence de l'intensité, les anciennes brèves... etc." This does not imply that there was an interval between the two phenomena, nor does it even preclude the assumption of an overlapping. Who, then, does maintain that there was such an interval?

Each of the ten chapters is an independent unit. Having read the "Introduction," the reader may begin with any one of them. In fact, the reader might do well to limber up with Chapter II or VII, for Chapter I, which explains the establishment of the various Romance vowel systems,



is both the longest and most involved of all. The authors assume no special knowledge of Romance linguistics on the part of the reader, and their exposition is generally simple and clear, at times a bit repetitious. A number of maps and diagrams are used. Some of the latter are oversimple and would be twice as effective if they were only a little more elaborate. Two of the three diagrams in the Notes on Chapter V, Part I, are either poorly done or ill-chosen; their series of occlusive-fricative consonants show a number of occlusives without any indication of fricative variants, which is precisely what those series should not show. In such a work as the *Essai* errors in the use of phonetic symbols, legends, etc., are a serious detriment to intelligibility. The list of the errata (which is not included in every volume!) corrects more than thirty-five of them, most of them quite important; and, what is worse, a number of others are not included in the list.

In conclusion, let the authors speak for themselves:

Il comptait beaucoup moins pour nous d'apporter la solution de tel ou tel problème soulevé par l'évolution phonétique des parlers galloromans que de dégager, à l'occasion de notre examen, certains principes et de proposer une méthode assortie à la conception moderne de la langue et de son évolution.

The *Essai* of Haudricourt and Juilland certainly deserves the attention of every student of linguistics.

FREDRICK JUNGEMANN

Columbia University

## BOOKS RECEIVED

- Berr, Henri, *Allemagne: le contre et le pour*. Paris, Michel, 1950. Pp. 112.
- Byrne, L. S. R., and E. L. Churchill, *A Comprehensive French Grammar*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1950. Pp. xxi + 515.
- Chesney, Kathleen, editor, *Fleurs de Rhétorique from Villon to Marot*. Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1950. Pp. vi + 119.
- Clark, Sister Mary Ursula, *The Cult of Enthusiasm in French Romanticism*. Washington, D. C., 1950. Pp. xviii + 210.
- Coutinho, Afrânio, *Aspectos da literatura barroca*. Rio de Janeiro, Editôra A Noite, 1950. Pp. 140.
- Danielsson, Bror, *Studies on the Accentuation of Polysyllabic Latin, Greek, and Romance Loan-Words in English*. Stockholm, Almqvist and Wiksell, (New York, Stechert-Hafner), 1948. Pp. xvi + 644.
- D'Annunzio, Gabriele, *International Naval Disarmament Conferences at Washington and Genoa*. Italian Text and English Translation. New York, S. F. Vanni, 1950. Pp. 107.
- de Segura, Juan, *Proceso de cartas de amores*. Edited and translated by Edwin B. Place. (Northwestern University Studies, Humanities Series 23) Evanston, Ill., Northwestern University Press, 1950. Pp. x + 160.
- Ernout, A., *Les Adjectifs latins en -osus et en -ulentus*. (Collection Linguistique publiée par la Société de Linguistique de Paris, LIV) Paris, Librairie C. Klincksieck, 1949. Pp. 120.
- Gerhardt, Mia I., *La Pastorale*. Assen (Netherlands), Van Gorcum and Co. N. V., 1950. Pp. 317.
- Martinet, A., *Phonology as Functional Phonetics*. London, Oxford University Press, 1949. Pp. 40.
- Meurant, René, *Le Jour se lève. La Maison du poète*. Bruxelles, Van Doorslaer, 1950. Pp. 20.
- Palfrey, Thomas R., *Le Panorama Littéraire de l'Europe (1833-1834)*. Une revue légitimiste sous la monarchie de juillet. (Northwestern University Studies, Humanities Series 22) Evanston, Ill., Northwestern University Press, 1950. Pp. 154.
- Voltaire, *Lettres inédites aux Tronchin*. Introduction de Bernard Gagnebin. Genève, Droz, 1950. Tome I, pp. xl + 229; Tome II, pp. 244; Tome III, pp. 258.
- Wade, Ira O., *Voltaire's Micromégas*. (Princeton Publication in Modern Language No. 10) Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1950. Pp. xii + 190.
- Watkins, W. B. C., *Shakespeare and Spenser*. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1950. Pp. ix + 339.

## VOLUME XLI: AUTHOR INDEX

- Alden, Douglas W., Jacques de Lacretelle for and against Proust, 108-124
- Bergin, Thomas G., *Marcabru e le fonti sacri dell'antica lirica romanza* by G. Errante, 211-213
- , *Guido Cavalcanti's Theory of Love. The Canzone d'Amore and Other Related Problems* by J. E. Shaw, 277-281
- Bertocci, Angelo P., *Saint-Marc Girardin —Bourgeois* by L. W. Wylie, 67-70
- Bigongiari, Dino, Notes on the Text of Dante, 3-13, 81-95
- Bowe, Forrest, *Bibliography of French Translations of English Works: 1700-1800* by C. A. Rochedieu, 144-151
- Brenes, Dalai, see Place, Edwin B.
- Brenner, Clarence D., *French Tragedy in the Time of Louis XV and Voltaire, 1715-1774* by H. C. Lancaster, 302-304
- Carpenter, Nan C., Rabelais and Musical Ideas, 14-25
- Conner, Wayne, The Influence of Tabourot des Accords on Balzac's *Contes drolatiques*, 195-205
- Edelman, Nathan, *Tragédie cornélienne, tragédie racinienne. Etude sur les sources de l'intérêt dramatique* by G. May, 135-141
- , The Mixed Metaphor in Descartes, 167-178
- Eoff, Sherman, The Formative Period of Goldós' Social-Psychological Perspective, 33-41
- Frame, Donald M., *The Universe of Pontus de Tyard* by J. C. Lapp, 281-284
- , *The Counter-Renaissance* by H. Haydn, 284-289
- Frohock, W. M., *Correspondance générale de Sainte-Beuve*, Volume VI edited by J. Bonnerot, 222-223
- Gillet, Joseph E., *Deux autos méconnus de Gil Vicente; Deux "autos" de Gil Vicente restitués à leur auteur; Les Sermons de Gil Vicente* by I. S. Révah, 216-218
- Gilman, Margaret, *L'Albatros Again*, 96-107
- Hatzfeld, Helmut, *Miguel de Cervantes und sein Don Quijote* by A. Rüegg, 293-298
- Hesse, Everett W., *El verdadero Dios Pan. Aut osacramental alegórico de Don Pedro Calderón de la Barca* by J. M. de Oasma, 298-299
- Hytier, Jean, *La Méthode* de M. Leo Spitzer, 42-59
- Jungemann, Fredrick, *Essai pour une histoire structurale du phonétisme français* by A. G. Haudricourt and A. G. Juilland, 309-313
- Knudson, Charles A., *French Precursors of the Chanson de Roland* by M. A. Pei, 125-129
- Kristeller, Paul Oskar, *Uno Scolaro del Poliziano a Napoli: Francesco Pucci* by M. Santoro, 132-133
- , *Der italienische Humanismus* by E. Garin, 218-219
- Lapp, John C., *Maurice Scève* by V. L. Saulnier, 289-293
- Levy, Raphael, *Rutebeuf: Le Miracle de Théophile* edited by G. Frank, 130-132
- Loomis, Laura Hibbard, The Passion Lance Relic and the War Cry Monjoie in the *Chanson de Roland* and Related Texts, 241-260
- Malakis, Emile, *Chateaubriand. Le Livre du Centenaire* by G. Collas et al., 304-305
- March, Harold, *Etudes sur le temps humain* by G. Poulet, 155-156
- May, Georges, *History of the Pre-Romantic Novel in England* by J. R. Foster, 62-64
- McPheeters, D. W., *Manual de bibliografía de la literatura española* by H. Seris, 232-234
- Misrahi, Jean, *Le Roman de Barlaam et Josaphat: recherches sur la tradition manuscrite latine et française* by J. Sonet, 276-277
- Mitchell, William J., *The Italian Madrigal* by A. Einstein, 133-135
- Mossner, Ernest Campbell, Beattie on Voltaire: an Unpublished Parody, 26-32
- Peckham, Lawton P. G., Jehan Renart: *Le Lai de l'Ombre* edited by J. Orr, 60
- , *Arthurian Tradition and Chrétien de Troyes* by R. S. Loomis, 214-216
- Pei, Mario A., *La Chanson de Roland e i Normanni* by E. Li Gotti, 129-130

- Peyre, Henri, *André Gide et la pensée allemande* by R. Lang, 151-155  
 —, *Diderot Studies* edited by O. E. Fellows and N. L. Torrey, 219-222  
 —, *The Life and Times of Henry Monnier. 1799-1877* by E. Melcher, 307-309  
 Place, Edwin B., and Dalai Brenes, *The Function of AOI in the Oxford Roland*, 161-166  
 Rhodes, S. A., *Mallarmé's Un Coup de dés: An Exegesis* by R. G. Cohn, 223-229  
 Roudiez, Leon S., *Rimbaud et le problème des Illuminations* by H. de Bouillane de Lacoste, 70-73  
 Spitzer, Leo, *Junk < French Jong*, 206-207  
 Sulger, Kurt, *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter* by E. R. Curtius, 208-211  
 Switzer, Richard, *A Precursor of René: le Baron de Saint-Castin*, 179-186  
 Templin, E. H., *Night Scenes in Tirso de Molina*, 261-273  
 Thorndike, Lynn, *Latin and Italian Grammar in the Year 1486*, 274-275  
 Torrey, Norman L., Denis Diderot: *Le Neveu de Rameau* edited by J. Fabre, 299-302  
 Vial, Fernand, *Charles Du Bos and English Literature* by A. P. Bertocci, 229-232  
 Viggiani, Carl A., *Sainte-Beuve: Correspondance générale*, Volume V edited by J. Bonnerot, 64-67  
 Wade, Ira O., *A Bibliographical List of Plays in the French Language, 1700-1789* by C. D. Brenner, 60-62  
 —, *Le Philosophe: Texts and Interpretation* by H. Dieckmann, 141-144  
 Wilkins, Ernest H., *Samuel Carter Hall on Foscolo*, 187-194  
 —, *Byron, Hobbhouse and Foscolo: New Documents in the History of a Collaboration* by E. R. Vincent, 305-306  
 Woodbridge Benjamin M., *Le Crépuscule des Maîtres* by L. Dumont-Wilden, 73-74

## VOLUME XLI: SUBJECT INDEX

- Albatros*, L', 96-107  
*AOI*, 161-166  
 Arthurian tradition, 214-216  
*Azalia et Célario*, 179-186  
 Balzac, 195-205  
 Baroque, 49-53, 261-273, 298-299  
 Baudelaire, 96-107  
 Beattie, James, 26-32  
 Beroaldo the Elder, Filippo, 274-275  
 Bertocci, Angelo Philip, *Charles Du Bos and English Literature* (review), 229-232  
 Bibliography, 60-62, 144-151, 232-234  
 Bonnerot, Jean, editor, *Sainte-Beuve: Correspondance générale*, Volumes V and VI (reviews), 64-67, 222-223  
 Bouillane de Lacoste, Henry de, *Rimbaud et le problème des Illuminations* (review), 70-73  
 Brenner, Clarence D., *A Bibliographical List of Plays in the French Language, 1700-1789* (review), 60-62  
 Byron, 305-306  
 Calderón de la Barca, 298-299  
*Canzone*, 81-95  
*Canzone d'Amore*, 277-281  
 Cavalcanti, Guido, 277-281  
 Cervantes, 293-298  
*Chanson de Roland*, La, 125-129, 129-130, 161-166, 241-260  
 Chateaubriand, 179-186, 304-305  
 Chrétien de Troyes, 214-216  
 Clarac, Pierre, see Collas, Georges  
 Cohn, Robert Greer, *Mallarmé's Un Coup de dés: An Exegesis* (review), 223-229  
 Collas, Georges, et al., *Chateaubriand. Le Livre du Centenaire* (review), 304-305  
 COMPARATIVE LITERATURE, 26-32, 62-64, 129-130, 144-151, 151-155, 179-186, 187-194, 208-211, 211-213, 214-216, 229-232, 241-260, 276-277, 284-289, 305-306  
*Contes drolatiques*, 195-205  
*Convivio*, 13

- Corneille, 135-141  
*Coup de dés, Un*, 223-229  
 Curtius, Ernst Robert, *Europäische Literatur und lateinisches Mittelalter* (review), 208-211
- Dante, 3-13, 81-95  
*De Monarchia*, 3-7  
*De Vulgari Eloquentia*, 7-13, 81-95  
 Delbos, Yvon, *see* Collas, Georges  
 Descartes, 167-178  
 Diderot, 219-222, 299-302  
 Dieckmann, Herbert, *Le Philosophe: Texts and Interpretation* (review), 141-144  
*Don Quijote*, 293-298  
 Du Bos, Charles, 229-232  
 Dumont-Wilden, L., *Le Crépuscule des Maitres* (review), 73-74  
 Durry, Marie-Jeanne, *see* Collas, Georges
- Einstein, Alfred, *The Italian Madrigal* (review), 133-135  
 Errante, Guido, *Marcabru e le fonti sacri dell'antica lirica romanza* (review), 211-213
- Fabre, Jean, editor, Denis Diderot: *Le Neveu de Rameau* (review), 299-302  
 Fellows, Otis E., and Norman L. Torrey, editors, *Diderot Studies* (review), 219-222  
*Fleurs du mal, Les*, 96-107  
 Foscolo, Ugo, 187-194, 305-306  
 Foster, James R., *History of the Pre-Romantic Novel in England* (review), 62-64  
 Frank, Grace, editor, Rutebeuf: *Le Miracle de Théophile* (review), 130-132
- FRENCH LITERATURE—
- MEDIEVAL, 60, 125-129, 129-130, 130-132, 161-166, 211-213, 214-216, 241-260, 276-277
- XVI. CENTURY, 14-25, 195-205, 281-284, 284-289, 289-293
- XVII. CENTURY, 135-141, 167-178
- XVIII. CENTURY, 26-32, 60-62, 62-64, 141-144, 144-151, 179-186, 219-222, 299-302, 302-304
- XIX. CENTURY, 64-67, 67-70, 70-73, 96-107, 195-205, 222-223, 223-229, 304-305, 307-309
- XX. CENTURY, 73-74, 108-124, 151-155, 229-232
- Galdós, Benito Pérez, 33-41  
 Garin, Eugenio, *Der italienische Humanismus* (review), 218-219  
 Gide, 151-155
- Hall, Samuel Carter, 187-194  
 Haudricourt, A. G., and A. G. Juilland, *Essai pour une histoire structurale du phonétisme français* (review), 309-313  
 Haydn, Hiram, *The Counter-Renaissance* (review), 284-289
- HISPANIC LITERATURE, 33-41, 232-234, 261-273, 293-298, 298-299
- Hobhouse, John Cam, 305-306  
 Humanism, Italian, 218-219
- Illuminations, Les*, 70-73
- ITALIAN LITERATURE, 3-13, 81-95, 132-133, 133-135, 187-194, 218-219, 277-281, 305-306
- Juilland, A. G., *see* Haudricourt, A. G.  
*Junk < French Junc*, 206-207
- La Dixmérie, Nicolas Bricaire de, 179-186  
 Lacretelle, Jacques de, 108-124  
*Lai de l'Ombre, Le*, 60  
 Lancaster, Henry C., *French Tragedy in the Time of Louis XV and Voltaire, 1715-1774* (review), 302-304  
 Lang, Renée, *André Gide et la pensée allemande* (review), 151-155  
 Lapp, John C., *The Universe of Pontus de Tyard* (review), 281-284  
 Le Savoureux, H., *see* Collas, Georges  
 Levailant, Maurice, *see* Collas, Georges  
 Li Gotti, Ettore, *La Chanson de Roland e i Normanni* (review), 129-130
- LINGUISTICS, 206-207, 274-275, 309-313
- Loomis, Roger S., *Arthurian Tradition and Chrétien de Troyes* (review), 214-216
- Madrigal, Italian, 133-135  
 Mallarmé, 223-229  
 Marcabru, 211-213  
 Martin-Chauffier, Louis, *see* Collas, Georges  
 May, Georges, *Tragédie cornélienne, tragédie racinienne. Etude sur les*

- sources de l'intérêt dramatique (review), 135-141
- Melcher, Edith, *The Life and Times of Henry Monnier. 1799-1877* (review), 307-309
- Miracle de Théphile, *Le*, 130-132
- Monjoie, 241-260
- Monnier, Henry, 307-309
- Moreau, Pierre, *see* Collas, Georges
- Neveu de Rameau, *Le*, 299-302
- Orr, John, editor, Jehan Renart: *Le Lai de l'Ombre* (review), 60
- Osma, José M. de, *El verdadero Dios Pan. Auto sacramental alegórico de Don Pedro Calderón de la Barca* (review), 298-299
- Outrey, Amédée, *see* Collas, Georges
- Pei, Mario A., *French Precursors of the Chanson de Roland* (review), 125-129
- Philosophe, *Le*, 141-144
- Poliziano, Angelo, 132-133
- Poulet, Georges, *Etudes sur le temps humain* (review), 155-156
- Pouthas, Charles H., *see* Collas, Georges
- Preromanticism, 62-64
- Proust, 108-124
- Provençal poetry, 211-213
- Pucci, Francesco, 132-133
- Rabelais, 14-25
- Racine, 135-141
- Renart, Jehan, 60
- Révah, I. S., *Deux autos méconnus de Gil Vicente; Deux "autos" de Gil Vicente restitués à leur auteur; Les Sermons de Gil Vicente* (review), 216-218
- Rimbaud, Arthur, 70-73
- Rochedieu, Charles A., *Bibliography of French Translations of English Works: 1700-1800* (review), 144-151
- Roman de Barlaam et Josaphat, *Le*, 276-277
- Rüegg, August, *Miguel de Cervantes und sein Don Quijote* (review), 293-298
- Rutebeuf, 130-132
- Saint-Castin, Jean-Vincent d'Abbadie de, 179-186
- Saint-Marc Girardin, 67-70
- Sainte-Beuve, 64-67, 222-223
- Santoro, Mario, *Uno Scolaro del Poliziano a Napoli: Francesco Pucci* (review), 132-133
- Saulnier, Verdun L., *Maurice Scève* (review), 289-293
- Scève, Maurice, 289-293
- Seris, Homero, *Manual de bibliografía de la literatura española* (review), 232-234
- Shaw, J. E., *Guido Cavalcanti's Theory of Love. The Canzone d'Amore and Other Related Problems* (review), 277-281
- Sonet, Jean, *Le Roman de Barlaam et Josaphat: recherches sur la tradition manuscrite latine et française* (review), 276-277
- Spitzer, Leo, *Linguistics and Literary History (Essays in Stylistics)* (review), 42-59
- Stylistics, 42-59
- Tabourot des Accords, Etienne, 195-205
- Tapié, Victor-L., *see* Collas, Georges
- Tirso de Molina, 261-273
- Torrey, Norman L., *see* Fellows, Otis E.
- Tyard, Pontus de, 281-284
- Univers, L'*, 281-284
- Verdadero Dios Pan, El*, 298-299
- Vicente, Gil, 216-218
- Vincent, E. R., *Byron, Hobhouse and Foscolo: New Documents in the History of a Collaboration* (review), 305-306
- Voltaire, 26-32
- Weil, Armand, *see* Collas, Georges
- Wylie, Laurence W., *Saint-Marc Girardin — Bourgeois* (review), 67-70



C51

0 E2E □  
1 328  
2 E32  
3 235  
4 538  
5 E85  
6 3E8

0	E	2	E	0
1	3	2	8	
2	E	3	2	
3	2	3	5	
4	5	3	8	
5	E	3	5	
6	5	3	8	